Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-089
Wednesday
8 May 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-089 *8 May 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: On 6 May 1991, the DAILY REPORT will begin phasing in new radio and television sourcelines that reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" and "Television Service" designations in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Medvedev on Implementation of INF Treaty *[Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 3 May]* 1
Karpov Meets U.S. Chief Delegate in Vienna *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Churkin on Bessmertnykh's Middle East Visit *[TASS]* 2
Churkin Sees No Change in Accord With U.S. *[IZVESTIYA 8 May]* 2
Presidential Spokesman Ignatenko Holds Briefing 2
Views Planned Visit by Jiang Zemin *[TASS]* 2
Walesa, Thatcher Visits Discussed *[TASS]* 2
SRV Leader's Visit Reviewed *[TASS]* 3
Delegate Comments During UN Peacekeeping Talks *[TASS]* 3
Issues on Israel, Arms Aired, Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 3
Yanayev Receives Ambassador's Credentials *[TASS]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze U.S. Activities, Remarks Cited *[TASS]* 6
Pentagon Set for Mideast 'Military Rivalry' *[Moscow International]* 7
Commentary Views U.S. Aim To Control Mideast *[Moscow International]* 7

China

Marshal Yazov's Beijing Visit Continues 7
Meets Jiang Zemin *[TASS]* 7
Meets Li Peng, President, Departs *[TASS]* 8
Jiang Zemin Cited on Upcoming Moscow Visit *[TASS]* 8
Observer Says Military Cooperation 'Necessary' *[Moscow International]* 8

Southeast Asia & Pacific

SRV Premier Discusses Ties With Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 8 May]* 9
Meets Pavlov *[TASS]* 9
Meets Lukyanov *[TASS]* 9
SRV's Nguyen Van Linh To Visit USSR *[TASS]* 9
Commentary on Scheduled Inter-Cambodian Dialogue *[Moscow International]* 9
Trade Relations With Philippines Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 10

Near East & South Asia

Bessmertnykh Leaves on Middle East Tour *[TASS]* 10
Visit to Israel Previewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 May]* 11
Bessmertnykh Cited on Conference *[NOVOYE VREMYA No. 18]* 12

Israeli Consul on Bessmertnykh Visit *[TASS]* 14
Churkin on Ties With Israel *[TRUD 8 May]* 14
Clarification of Soviet Mideast Policy Urged *[NOVOYE VREMYA No. 16]* 15
Ties With Saudi Arabia Said Getting 'Closer' *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 16
Implications of 'Kurdish Problem' Examined *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 May]* 16

West Europe

Gorbachev, Mitterrand Hold News Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 17
Diplomat Cited on Talks *[IZVESTIYA 8 May]* 25

Latin America & Caribbean

'Constructive' El Salvador Peace Move Welcomed *[PRAVDA 8 May]* 25

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session 27
Emergency Session on Armenia Rejected *[TASS]* 27
Victory Day Address Given *[PRAVDA 7 May]* 27
Presidents' Joint Statement Considered *[PRAVDA 7 May]* 28
Deputy Reports on Exit-Entry Law *[Moscow TV]* 28

Political & Social

Gorbachev Appoints New Advisers *[TASS]* 28
Gorbachev Meets With Soviet Germans *[PRAVDA 8 May]* 29
TASS Reviews Soviet Press for 8 May 29
Alksnis Criticizes 'Concessions' to West *[Berlin ADN]* 31
Yakovlev Interviewed on Future of Perestroyka *[Moscow TV]* 31
KGB Secrets 'Revealed' at Meeting *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 31
KGB Special Service 70th Anniversary Marked *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 32
Stankevich Warns About KGB, Army *[Vienna Radio]* 32
Frolov Defends Perestroyka, PRAVDA's Role *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 33
PRAVDA Editorial Views CPSU Plenum *[7 May]* 34
CPSU Control Commission Plenum Report *[PRAVDA 26 Apr]* 37
Leaders' Agreement Surprises Kuzbass *[TRUD 30 Apr]* 38
Sobchak Interviewed on Political Scene *[MOSCOW NEWS No. 13]* 38
Social Scientists Draw Up Anticrisis Plan *[TASS]* 40
USSR Expanding Cooperation With Interpol *[Moscow International]* 41

Economic

Coal Ministry, Trade Union React to Coal Accord *[Radio Rossii]* 41
Vorkuta Committee To End Strike 10 May *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Situation in Kuzbass Begins To Stabilize *[TASS]* 41
One-Third of Mines Remain Idle *[TASS]* 41
Some Mines Expected To End Strike *[TASS]* 41
Miners' Strike Causes Production Shortages *[Moscow TV]* 42
Official Denies New Price Hike Rumors *[Radio Rossii]* 42
Railway Workers To Receive 50-Percent Raise *[Moscow TV]* 42
Unemployment Forecast of 30 Million for 1992 *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 May]* 42
Decree on Insurance Compensation Adjustments *[PRAVDA 7 May]* 42

Scientific

'Progress M-7' Spacecraft Jettisoned From Mir *[TASS]* 43
Spacecraft Burns Up in Atmosphere *[TASS]* 43

Military

Marshal Kulikov Discusses WWII Victory *[TASS]* 43
Polozkov Meets With Defense Ministry Personnel *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 May]* 43
Surkov, Shlyaga Address Committee Secretaries *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 May]* 44
Russian Presidential Election Instructions Given *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 May]* 44
'Democrats' Anti-Army Sentiments Condemned *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 May]* 45
Defense Ministry Spokesman on Shorter Naval Terms *[TASS]* 45
Reasons Given for New Probe Into Submarine Loss *[IZVESTIYA 2 May]* 46
Soviet Cruiser Leaves Black Sea for Arctic *[TASS]* 46

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic Leaders Pay Official Visit to Washington *[Riga Radio]* 47
Attend Congressional Committee Meeting *[Riga Radio]* 47
Washington Activities Reported *[Vilnius Radio]* 47
Tallinn Interrepublican Meeting Examined *[IZVESTIYA 7 May]* 47
Estonia's Savisaar on Selling Shares to Workers *[Tallinn Radio]* 49
Estonian Minister Discusses Economic Problems *[Tallinn International]* 49
Estonian Communications Ministry's Future Viewed *[Tallinn Radio]* 49
Latvia Demand Price Decreases, Union Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Latvian Meat, Dairy Production To Be Reduced *[Riga Radio]* 50
Riga OMON Commander Shot, Sustains Wound *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 May]* 51
Lithuanian Says USSR Uninterested in Talks *[Vilnius Radio]* 51
Prunskiene on 'Sober Approach' to Independence *[PRAVDA 7 May]* 51
Lithuanian 'Future Forum' Stances Noted *[Vilnius Radio]* 51
Plot Against Landsbergis Reportedly 'Ripening' *[Vilnius Radio]* 52
Lithuanian Official on Attacks on Customs Posts *[Vilnius Radio]* 52

RSFSR

7 May RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported *[Moscow TV]* 52
Yeltsin Signs Order on Monitoring Land Reform *[Moscow Radio]* 53
RSFSR Presidential Election Amendments Reported *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Apr]* 53
Ryzhkov Highlights Social Issues for Campaign *[Moscow International]* 54
Democratic Russia Names Candidates *[TASS]* 54
Starovoytova Nominated For Vice Presidency *[Radio Rossii]* 54
Yeltsin Holds Talks with Watanabe in Moscow *[Tokyo KYODO]* 55
Yakut Seeks Cooperation With Guangdong, Shenzhen *[Moscow International]* 55
Protocol Establishing RSFSR KGB Signed *[PRAVDA 7 May]* 56
Sverdlovsk KGB Expels 'Degenerate' Members *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 May]* 56
RSFSR Manipulators Behind Vorkuta Strike *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 May]* 56
Leningrad To Vote on Reverting to St. Petersburg *[Radio Rossii]* 60
Kaliningrad To Hold Referendum on Changing Name *[Radio Rossii]* 60
Moscow Gorkom Criticizes Anticrisis Program *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Apr]* 60
Details of Ingush-Cossack Clash Reported *[IZVESTIYA 1 May]* 60
Dzasokhov Visits Ryazan Oblast Over Holiday *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 61

Western Republics

Belorussian Official on Anticrisis Program *[Moscow TV]* 61
Belorussia Signs Economic Agreement With CSFR *[Minsk Radio]* 62
Belorussia's Kebich on Union Treaty *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 2 May]* 62
Roots of Belorussian 'Explosion' Pondered *[TRUD 1 May]* 63
Crimean Tatars Send Letter to Gorbachev *[Moscow Radio]* 66
Draft of New Ukraine Constitution Published *[Moscow Radio]* 66
Moldovan Secretaries Welcome Anticrisis Stance *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 67

Caucasus

Georgian Power Engineering Ministry Created *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 20 Apr]* 67
Minister Appointed *[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 24 Apr]* 67
Georgian Supreme Soviet Renames Ministry *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 20 Apr]* 67
Wording of Statute on Military Service Changed *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 20 Apr]* 67
Ter-Petrosyan Gives News Conference 7 May *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Accuses Army of Interference *[TASS]* 68
Kochetov Refutes Allegations *[TASS]* 69
Shatalin, Kochetov Cited on Transcaucasus *[IZVESTIYA 8 May]* 69
Shatalin Denies Claimed Transcaucasus Visit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 May]* 71
Attacks on Armenian Villages Described 71
Atrocities Reported *[Yerevan Radio]* 71
11 Armenian Troops Killed *[Radio Rossii]* 72
Death Toll of 23 Claimed *[AFP]* 72
'Demolished Houses' Reported *[AFP]* 73
Armenia Says Incidents 'Warning to All' *[Yerevan Radio]* 73
Armenian Supreme Soviet Appeals for Unity *[Yerevan Radio]* 74
Armenia Investigating Soviet Troop 'Inactivity' *[Yerevan International]* 74
Border Situation, Arrival of Refugees Reviewed *[Yerevan Radio]* 74
Occupation of Power Plant, Party Premises Denied *[Radio Rossii]* 75
Kafarova Criticizes Call for Special Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 75
Sees 'Good Sign' *[TASS]* 75
Azerbaijan Foreign Ministry Issues Statement *[TASS]* 76

Medvedev on Implementation of INF Treaty

AU0605110991 Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 3 May 91 p 5

[Interview with Lieutenant General Vladimir Medvedev, head of the Soviet National Center for the Reduction of Nuclear Danger, by NOVOSTI correspondent Valeriy Pogrebenkov for NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, "on the occasion of the destruction of the last U.S. cruise missile in Arizona on 1 May in the presence of a Soviet expert group headed by Medvedev:" "The Last Missiles Are Scrapped"]

[Text] [Pogrebenkov] On 1 June three years will have passed since the INF Treaty came into force. What has happened during this period?

[Medvedev] Indeed, the first three-year state of a so-far-unprecedented treaty is coming to an end. Unprecedented because for the first time in history both superpowers have committed themselves to the destruction of two classes of missiles, of land-based intermediate-range missiles with a range of 1,000 to 5,500 km and of short-range missiles with a range of 500 to 1,000 km. For the Soviet Union this category contains six types of missiles and 1,846 units, for the United States four types with 846 units.

After the elimination of its last land-based cruise missiles, the United States, according to a Pentagon report, will destroy the last "Pershing-2" in Longhorne, Texas, on 6 May. The Soviet side will destroy its last RSD-10, which is known as SS-20 in the West, in the area of Kapustin Yar on 12 May.

[Pogrebenkov] Could the USSR have fulfilled its obligations under the treaty ahead of time?

[Medvedev] The process of liquidation was strictly synchronized by both sides to reach the goal at the same time. Many factors had to be taken into consideration: For instance, we had more missiles and, therefore, had to be quicker with their destruction. Nevertheless, both sides will conclude the destruction of the missiles two weeks before the end of the three-year period. This lead will be used to clear up the question of liquidating the warheads of the "Pershing-1a," which belong to the Bundeswehr, the nuclear warheads of which are, however, in the hands of the Americans.

[Pogrebenkov] Have there been many difficulties in fulfilling this treaty?

[Medvedev] Of course, there were problems, technical problems and such with a political touch, but this was not unexpected in this completely new task.

[Pogrebenkov] Does the destruction of the last missiles mean that this document is now part of history?

[Medvedev] Not at all. The treaty is not limited to any period; according to the protocol on inspections, each side has the right to on-site inspections for 13 years after the coming into force of the treaty—until the year 2001.

[Pogrebenkov] Why 13 years?

[Medvedev] Probably, 10 or five years would also have been enough. Perhaps the first disarmament treaty needed a special stability reserve of mutual trust.

[Pogrebenkov] Was the elimination of the missiles very expensive?

[Medvedev] We all have to get used to the idea that disarmament is not cheap. For the time being, one can say that the costs for the elimination of the missiles and the inspections are estimated at some dozens of millions of rubles—certainly less than is spent for the lethal arms race every year.

[Pogrebenkov] What ecological consequences will the destruction of the missiles have? After all, they were not only disassembled, but also detonated?

[Medvedev] Before we started to fulfill the treaty, we made an expert report. Ecological supervisors were constantly in the area of destruction and took air samples before and after the detonations. We strictly adhered to the ecological requirements.

[Pogrebenkov] What is the significance of the INF Treaty for future disarmament agreements, in your view?

[Medvedev] First of all, the treaty shows that the two superpowers are able to seriously implement agreements. Here a breach, so to speak, was made for the following treaty on the reduction of the strategic offensive weapons. Second, valuable experiences were gathered for inspections.

Karpov Meets U.S. Chief Delegate in Vienna

LD0605124391 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 6 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov today received Ambassador John Maresca, U.S. chief delegate at the Vienna talks on confidence and security-building measures, and had a talk with him.

Matters connected with the state of affairs at the Vienna talks were considered and prospects for further negotiation discussed.

Churkin on Bessmertnykh's Middle East Visit

LD0605140691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 6 May 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow, 6 May (TASS)—USSR Foreign Affairs Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh is setting off on a trip round the Near East on 8 May. This was announced today at a briefing by Vitaliy Churkin, head of the information directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The aim of the trip is to contribute to initiating a process for a Near East settlement.

According to the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman, the head of the Soviet foreign policy department will visit Syria, Jordan, Israel, Egypt, and "in principle plans to visit Lebanon too." The Lebanese part of the trip "is now being worked on, and it is still not finally clear whether it will take place," the diplomat added.

Vitaliy Churkin told journalists of the timetable for the trip. On 8 May Aleksandr Bessmertnykh will arrive in Damascus, and fly from Damascus to Amman on the morning of 9 May. He will then go [by road] from Amman to Tel Aviv, where he will leave for Cairo in the afternoon. He will remain in Cairo until 12 May. It is possible that the minister will then visit Beirut.

Answering a question about whether it is possible that diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel will be restored during Aleksandr Bessmertnykh's visit to that country, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman said that "We regard the possibility of restoring diplomatic relations with Israel in the context of the process of a Near East settlement." "So I would not go presuming that during the minister of foreign affairs' visit to Israel there must certainly be a restoration of diplomatic relations," he added.

Vitaliy Churkin also announced that Aleksandr Bessmertnykh hopes to have a meeting with Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee in the context of his trip to the Near East. The possibility of organizing such a meeting is now being worked on.

The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman noted that the Soviet side will inform its American partners about the nature of the talks held during Aleksandr Bessmertnykh's visit to the Near East.

Churkin Sees No Change in Accord With U.S.

PM0705210791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[G. Charodeyev report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry: No Need To Dramatize"]

[Excerpts] Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, spoke at a regular briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. [passage omitted]

A Canadian television correspondent asked whether the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting had been canceled. Churkin replied that "the accord reached earlier between the USSR and the United States on a summit meeting in Moscow before the first six months of this year are out remains in force."

Presidential Spokesman Ignatenko Holds Briefing

Views Planned Visit by Jiang Zemin

LD0705145991 Moscow TASS in English 1444 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Kondratenko]

[Text] Moscow May 7 TASS—Chinese Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin, who is also chairman of the Central Military Commission, arrives on an official visit to the Soviet Union next week, President Gorbachev's spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told reporters today.

This will be the second summit after Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to China in May 1989, Ignatenko said.

"Much has been achieved" in the past two years, he said. The sides approach the forthcoming meeting with the Chinese leader "with a solid baggage in the political and economic spheres", he said.

Bilateral trade between the two countries has grown to nearly 3 billion roubles. Considerable progress has been made at talks on a border settlement and troop reductions in border areas, he said.

The Chinese delegation will visit Leningrad—Shanghai's sister city, Ignatenko said.

Walesa, Thatcher Visits Discussed

LD0705154191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1430 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Lyudmila Aleksandrova, Aleksandr Kanishchev, and Igor Peskov]

[Excerpt] Moscow 7 May (TASS)—[passage omitted] Vitaliy Ignatenko announced that Mikhail Gorbachev plans to visit Oslo in May or June of this year to deliver a lecture in connection with the award to him last year of the Nobel Peace Prize. This visit is contained in the working plan of the president's trips, but "it will not take place in the next two weeks" he said.

The president's aide announced that the visit of Polish President Lech Walesa to the USSR is being postponed, but "its postponement has not come from Moscow." He said that at the moment it is impossible to give specific dates for the visit.

Margaret Thatcher is to come to Moscow on 27 May at the invitation of Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife, said Vitaliy Ignatenko. A visit by Giulio Andreotti, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Italy, is expected during the last third of May.

Answering a question about the possibility of establishing diplomatic relations with Israel, the head of the president's press service said that during the brief visit of Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, the minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, to Tel Aviv, which will take place on 10 May, this issue might be raised. "The two sides are currently exchanging opinions on this issue."

SRV Leader's Visit Reviewed

LD0705192291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1325 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Lyudmila Aleksandrova and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow, 7 May (TASS)—Do Muoi, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, who is paying an official visit to the Soviet Union will probably be received by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev. This was announced today by presidential aide Vitaliy Ignatenko, head of his press service, at a briefing in the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

The visit by the head of the Vietnamese Government, Vitaliy Ignatenko recalled, has already been going on for several days. He has been recieved by the head of the Union legislature Anatoliy Lukyanov and the head of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers Valentin Pavlov. Vitaliy Ignatenko said that these visits "have been dictated not by any kind of extraordinary circumstances, but by the need to 'synchronize watches' on problems of bilateral relations and international life."

Vitaliy Ignatenko stated with satisfaction that in the course of the year, trade turnover between the USSR and Vietnam has balanced out, although it is also not large: $500 million. The Vietnamese side has even started to pay back to the Soviet side its debt of 6 billion. "The Vietnamese economy is on the ascent and new opportunities for the development of economic relations with this country have appeared for us," the presidential aide said.

Delegate Comments During UN Peacekeeping Talks

LD0705161191 Moscow TASS in English 0921 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] United Nations May 7 TASS—Further prospects for UN peace-keeping measures were discussed on Monday by the UN special committee on peace-keeping operations.

Most committee members believe the latest series of qualitatively new UN operations have enriched notably the world community's collective experience. Canadian delegate Philipp Kirsch specially noted in this connection the work of UN elections supervision missions in Nicaragua and Haiti, as well as the UN mission for the West Sahara referendum and the UN supervisory mission in Iraq and Kuwait. UN peace-keeping operations have gone through a definite evolution. He believes it is time to decide, especially after the Gulf events, whether the UN is capable of preventing conflicts or is doomed to nothing but post-factum actions.

Austrian representative Helmut Freudenschuss called for a clearer definition of what is meant by "threat to peace and international security" in this or that region. He said it was necessary to decide at what stage the United Nations should resort to measures envisaged for such cases by its charter, including the use of force.

Soviet delegate Sergey Lavrov moved that the committee should focus primarily on the efficiency of UN peace-keeping operations. He stressed that such operations should be mostly preventive, since, as shown by the Gulf events, it is cheaper to prevent a conflict than to eliminate it. It saves money when conflicts are settled at an early stage, he noted. Lavrov urged the committee to seek new sources to finance peace-keeping operations. Corporations, non-government organisations and private business, for instance, could contribute substantially to this cause.

The work of the special committee is arousing keen interest. Representatives of ten states were accredited as observers at its first meeting. They included Brazil, Finland, Greece, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Singapore, Turkey and Uruguay.

Issues on Israel, Arms Aired, Discussed

LD0705190491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1730 GMT 5 May 91

[From the "International Situation: Questions and Answers" program hosted by All-Union Radio commentator Kazbek Basiyev; with Igor Surguchev, commentator Vladimir Pasko, commentator Sergey Pravdin, and commentator Yuriy Isayev—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Basiyev] We have a letter from three war and labor veterans in Irkutsk, signed on behalf of them all by (Mikhail Aleksandrovich Yegorov). It asks the following question: Why is the Soviet Union moving toward establishing diplomatic relations with Israel, an aggressor country that has been taunting the Arab people for 40 years, a country that rejects UN resolutions? the writer of the letter asks: Do we really have to meet every wish of Uncle Sam? What can we say on this score?

[Surguchev] Well, the first thing is that the Soviet Union has not yet restored diplomatic relations with Israel, so Comrade (Yegorov) is wide of the mark on this point.

The opening of an Israeli consulate in our country and a Soviet one in Israel represents merely a step in the direction of normalizing relations. Even so, it cannot be denied that contacts between our countries are expanding, and it looks as though matters are moving toward the restoration of full diplomatic links. The first visit by a USSR foreign minister to Israel is coming up soon as part of his trip to the Near East.

I should not evince surprise and, far less so indignation, at such a development of events. The absence of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Tel Aviv is in principle an abnormal phenomenon, and I am in agreement with our former foreign minister Shevardnadze who called the rupture of relations with Israel a mistake on our part. For this reason I regard the line of renewing diplomatic links with that country as correct, one that accords with our desire to play an active role in the Near East and facilitates a just and peaceful settlement in the region. Moreover, one should not overlook the fact that more and more of our citizens are becoming citizens of Israel. This, alas, is a sorrowful fact for us. At the same time, however, it is a factor bringing the two countries closer together.

I am sure that if the restoration of diplomatic relations comes about, it will not affect the USSR's principled approach to resolving the Arab-Israeli dispute. For the fact is that the maintenance of such relations with one state or another has never signified approval of that state's policies either as a whole or in particular respects. So it is not a question of our consenting to repressions against Palestinians or to Israel holding on to territories it has seized. We have always quite justifiably condemned that, and I do not believe we shall renounce our views.

So you can see from everything I have said that I do not consider that we are doing Uncle Sam's bidding, as some suggest. In my view, we are proceeding from our own interests and a wish to facilitate in an effective way the onset of peace in the near East, which is close to our southern borders. I am not a supporter of the line that, on the basis of a coincidence of views between Moscow and Washington as to the desirability of normalizing Soviet-Israeli relations, the conclusion should be drawn that the Soviet Union is supposedly trailing along in the wake of the United States. Regrettably, there are quite a few in this country who are inclined to perceive in exactly that way any manifestation of accord between the USSR and the United States. This would appear to stem from an inferiority complex besetting a certain section of our citizens, because of the serious internal squabbling afflicting our country. It is natural that such squabbling has a negative impact on our international standing but not to the extent, one would think, that we would do something contrary to our own interests just because the Americans wanted us to.

Now I shall return to the problem of the restoration of Soviet-Israeli relations, for I have something else to say about that. While I approve in principle our line of rapprochement with Israel, I would even so not rush into renewing diplomatic relations. My contention is that Israel first ought to demonstrate its readiness for serious and constructive dialogue with the Arabs and remove the obstructions to genuine reconcilation with them. Indeed, this was the position our country was still taking not long ago, and I do not see any basis for moving away from it. Israel now has a real opportunity to display such an approach where plans for a regional peace conference on the Near East are concerned, and thereby open the way not only to direct talks with the Arabs but also to normalizing relations with the Soviet Union. In the final analysis, it seems to me that the Jewish state should have just as great an interest in this as we have.

The issues of arms control still attract the attention of our listeners. Comrade (Kovalevskiy) from Simferopol asks: Has the treaty on the elimination of medium and shorter-range missiles in Europe, signed by the Soviet Union and the United States three years ago, been fulfilled? Sergey Ivanovich (Pilipenko) from Lvov wonders about other aspects of the issue: Why do the Soviet Union and the United States, while agreeing on unilaterally eliminating and reducing weapons, do so without taking into account the arms belonging to other states? he writes. How can exports of arms be reconciled with a new climate in international relations?

Esteemed comrades, your questions are being answered by my colleague Vladimir Pasko, commentator.

[Pasko] First, on medium and shorter-range missiles. The Americans are going to destroy the last batch of their Pershings in a couple of days and thus will complete the implementation of the treaty. We are destroying our last missiles of that type on 12 May. Everything is proceeding according to schedule, as was agreed. We can say that the first breakthrough in the sphere of nuclear weapons has taken place.

At the moment, another issue is already in question: on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons. The text of a new treaty—apart from several technical issues—has been agreed on. Judging by their statements, however, the parties do not link the signing of this treaty with the next summit. The reason suggested is the disagreements that have arisen concerning the interpretation of one of the articles of the treaty on conventional arms in Europe, which was signed in Paris last year. One may disagree with such a linkage and criticize it, but it has arisen. But still I believe that the treaty is going to be signed. It will be signed because both the Soviet Union and the United States are interested in it. Both countries' nuclear arsenals are excessively large. The Soviet Union and the United States account for 95 percent of the total amount of nuclear weapons in the world. This fact, like, probably, no other fact, shows, if you allow me to say so, what a nonsensical situation both countries achieved as a result of the cold war and the practically unlimited arms race resulting from it. At the same time, it answers the

question why the Soviet Union and the United States can afford a reduction, up to a certain level, regardless of other powers.

The view that this is being done without taking into consideration their arsenal at all, however—as Comrade (Pilipenko) thinks—is mistaken. Let me remind you that our concept of nuclear arms reduction suggested from the very start that, at a certain stage, the process should be joined by France, Britain, and China. As to the United States, they foresee an even more comprehensive list: They constantly speak of the necessity of also taking into consideration the countries that are just moving toward the creation of nuclear weapons. The same holds true if we think of the approaches toward the reduction of other weapons, including conventional weapons. From the press alone you can see how painfully the treaty on conventional arms in Europe was born. Why did the talks proceed with such difficulty? Because, even if we disregard the political obstacles that arose on the way to the treaty, the parties were carefully calculating the balance. The same kind of detailed calculation is being made for unilateral reductions. Our reductions in the European part of the country would have been impossible if they led to a military superiority of the North Atlantic Alliance. Neither would we agree to a reduction of our forces in Asia if we saw that the military balance did not allow us to do so.

Now a few words concerning the arms trade. Indeed, certain conditions are shaping up now for the reduction of such trade. Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and the possibility of Iraq using means of mass destruction during the war showed very clearly how dangerous uncontrolled arms trade can be. The necessity of working out some agreement on this issue is being voiced by virtually all countries. We have also spoken in favor of starting a dialogue. Moreover, we have outlined certain concepts in our approach to resolving this issue. One such concept is that the principle of reasonable sufficiency for defense purposes should be applied to the arms trade. Clearly, this will demand a solution for a number of other issues, specifically, the issue of openness, and not only on the part of arms dealers but also on the part of their customers. All this is by no means easy; however, I do hope that some movement will start in this direction of arms control, as well. It will start because virtually everybody is interested in establishing such control. [passage omitted]

Yanayev Receives Ambassador's Credentials

LD0705160491 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 7 TASS—USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev today received credentials in the Kremlin from ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Sri Lanka Democratic Socialist Republic Nissanka Parakrama Wijeueratne, the Republic of Bulgaria Vladimir Borisov Velchev and Bolivia—Javier Murillo de la Rocha.

Yanayev had talks with the ambassadors after the presentation ceremony, which was attended by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Valeriy Nikolayenko.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze U.S. Activities, Remarks Cited

LD0805084691 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 8 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Matyash]

[Text] Washington May 8 TASS— Former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on Tuesday met members of the U.S. Congressional Commissions for Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Shevardnadze, the president of the Soviet Foreign Policy Association, is in the United States on a private visit.

Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations Claiborne Pell and leader of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Lee Hamilton welcomed Shevardnadze and wished the Soviet Union success in carrying out its reforms and democratic processes.

They said the United States is interested in Soviet perestroyka and stressed the need to develop contacts between the U.S. Congress and the Soviet parliament to promote a continuous political dialogue between the two countries.

Shevardnadze "informed the committees about the situation in the Soviet Union and political, social, and economic processes in the country and stressed the importance of healthy Soviet-U.S. relations for preserving peace in the world."

The meeting was attended by Soviet ambassador to the United States Viktor Komplektov.

Earlier in the day, Shevardnadze met members of the U.S. Commission for Security and Cooperation in Europe, representatives of U.S. business circles and members of the editorial board of the Washington TIMES newspaper.

Shevardnadze delivered a speech at the Brookings Institute. He said that "the cold war is over, as is the era of great ideological confrontation".

"I intentionally speak about this as a fait accompli and have no doubts that we and all of mankind will display common sense and the will and desire to preclude a return to the past," he said.

"I think we have solved, in principle, the problem of military challenges—attempts to achieve world or regional domination by force. Our two countries have come to this conclusion through close cooperation. The Soviet Union and the United States can bring their rivalry under control and, understanding their responsibility, act as allies when peace and order are in jeopardy," he said.

Shevardnadze stressed the need to take comprehensive and urgent measures to promote the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and other highly-dangerous arms.

"There are three top-priority tasks in this respect: to sign the almost prepared Soviet-U.S. treaty on radical cuts in strategic offensive weapons, to limit and ban nuclear weapons testing and to conclude an international convention to ban and destroy stockpiles of chemical weapons.

"We should resolve problems concerning the treaty on the reduction of conventional forces in Europe and ratify this truly historic document as soon as possible," he said.

On the situation in the Soviet Union, Shevardnadze said that "until recently, it was not very exciting. There was a growing feeling of danger and a threat of dictatorship. Fortunately, democratic forces recognised this threat just in time to hold mass demonstrations in support of society's renovation".

"The agreement reached at the end of April between Soviet president Mikhail Gorbachev and leaders of nine Soviet republics on joint actions to bring the country out of the crisis is also promising. The agreement provides a basis for building a union of sovereign states with a new constitution and state structures.

"All this will be hard to implement and require much more time than is expected. However, there is growing hope that we will manage to avoid the worse—a military coup or a civil war," he said.

"The economic renovation of the Soviet Union will take many years. We will have to do this mostly ourselves, but we will need not charity but technological, intellectual and financial help from the outside on preferential terms.

"In this situation, it is important to support new nascent tendencies and cardinal changes. We are facing big difficulties and are short on time. One can say that it is better not to offer help hastily and take risks, but what is more risky?

"If our reforms fail, the risk will not be only material. The country's return to the past will be a catastrophe for its peoples and will not meet anybody else's interests in the world, for it will bring the world back to where it was and from which we all suffered.

"I'll be frank. I know that the U.S. Administration and the Congress are considering issuing extra credit to the Soviet Union to buy U.S. foodstuffs. I'll tell you bluntly: their decision will directly affect reforms and democratic processes in the USSR. This is not an exaggeration, and I hope that the United States will make the right choice, motivated by its own interests and the interests of the future.

"Believe me that your help will be vital, not only materially but psychologically as well, helping us to hold out," Shevardnadze said.

Pentagon Set for Mideast 'Military Rivalry'

LD0705162791 Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] The U.S. Secretary of Defense, Dick Cheney, is visiting the Gulf states. He began his tour with Saudi Arabia and will go on to visit five more nations. Here is a comment by Vladislav Kozyakov:

The visit comes after a recent tour of the Middle East by the Secretary of State, Baker, who had talks in Israel, the Arab nations and who also paid a visit to Kislovodsk in the USSR to meet with Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh. The purpose of Mr. Baker's tour was to find a formula for a peaceful political settlement. One would expect of the defence secretary's tour continued efforts with that goal in mind. It would be reasonable to expect the Pentagon to undertake steps that would help return the situation to its prewar condition and withdraw the troops home. Washington has declared that the U.S. had no intention of keeping a high military profile in the region or contribute to the arms race there. However, Mr. Cheney's talks in the Gulf appear to be centered on military preparations. Most of the U.S. military hardware is likely to stay there. Only 25 percent of tanks and other hardware has been withdrawn, the rest will be sold or stored at depots. A total of 300 tanks, 300 armored infantry vehicles, and 100 helicopters worth $5 billion will remain at depots in the region.

Another issue on the agenda is the setting up of forward staff headquarters of the Florida-based U.S. Central Command in the region. The U.S. naval presence in the region will be expanded and regular exercises will be held there. A military base is to be set up on the Kuwaiti island of Bubiyan, complete with runways, hangars and barracks to house (?the) 3,000 troops. A similar base may be set up in Qatar or Amman. Major supplies of U.S. weapons are being discussed in the Congress. According to the US NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, the administration has issued a classified report to the Congress exploring the possibility of arms sales to Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Egypt, Israel, and Turkey, worth a toal of $18 billion. The impression one gets is that the Pentagon is getting ready to (?form) more military rivalry in the region rather than seeking a situation of reliable stability based on arms control and political accords.

Commentary Views U.S. Aim To Control Mideast

LD0705184591 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 7 May 91

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] The American Defense Secretary Richard Cheney is making a tour of the countries situated in the Persian Gulf area. Under discussion are questions relating to the establishment of a security system in the region. How does the American defense secretary view it? Yuriy Solton provides the answer:

According to Richard Cheney, two factors can insure stability in the region: the American military presence and also additional deliveries of weapons to the countries friendly with the United States. What does it mean in practice? First of all, a group of officers of the American Central Command keeping the Middle East and Southwest Asian countries, South Asia, and North Africa under its control will be made responsible for the Persian Gulf area. American weaponry depots with tanks, artillery pieces, and aircraft are to be deployed on the Arabian peninsula. The number of American warships patrolling the Persian Gulf waters is to be increased. Regular military and naval exercises, with the involvement of regional countries are planned, and, finally, the United States demands for itself an access to airbases situated in the region in case of any emergency. It's clear that there will be more American forces in the Persian Gulf than in the past, the defence secretary told the journalists [as heard].

As far as additional weapons deliveries are concerned, Washington seems to underestimate the lessons of the past war. Without question, the countries of the region crammed with weapons, not without United States active help, were, are, and will be the main cause of tension and possible conflicts in the region. As it became known, the Washington Administration has sent a secret report to Congress informing that opportunities are being studied for selling Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Egypt, Israel and Turkey $18 billion worth of military hardware. The newspaper WASHINGTON POST quotes Washington officials as saying that weapons in trustworthy hands serve the interests of security and containment.

Some may find this kind of argument convincing. As for me, writes Yuriy Solton, I see behind the attempt to set up an American-style system of security in the region Washington's intention to take that strategically and economically important area under its control and provide American war concerns at the same time with a reliable market for selling their weaponry. A policy of this kind can hardly lead to peace and stability, Yuriy Solton writes in conclusion.

China

Marshal Yazov's Beijing Visit Continues

Meets Jiang Zemin

LD0705121991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1113 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Sorokin]

[Text] Beijing, 7 May (TASS)—A meeting today between Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, who is in the PRC on an official visit, and Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CCP Central

Committee and chairman of the PRC Central Military Commission, passed in a friendly and cordial atmosphere.

The minister handed the Chinese leader greetings from M.S. Gorbachev. He shared the impressions he had from his stay in Beijing and his trip around the country. The deepest of them, the minister said, were linked with the creative labor of the great Chinese people.

Jiang Zemin told the Soviet guest and the persons accompanying him about the successes achieved in socialist contruction in the PRC following the Third Plenum of the CCP Central Committee of the 11th Convocation, in the course of conducting reforms in the country and implementing a policy of external openness.

Taking part in the meeting were PRC Minister of National Defense Colonel-General Qin Jiwei and other Chinese officials. USSR Ambassador to the PRC N.N. Solovyev was present.

Meets Li Peng, President, Departs

LD0705172691 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] Beijing May 7 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov, on an official visit to China, today met Prime Minister Li Peng. The prime minister said that China sincerely wishes the Soviet Union to overcome temporary difficulties as soon as possible and to preserve the country's unity and stability.

Li continued that the present visit by the Soviet defence minister is an "important event in relations between the armies of the two countries and is an important aspect of Chinese-Soviet relations."

"We believe that the development of good-neighbourly relations between China and the USSR on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence meets the interests of the two states and promotes peace in Asia and all over the world," Li stressed.

The Soviet defence minister was received by Chinese President Yang Shangkun. Yang said that the Chinese people have always entertained the feelings of friendship for the Soviet people.

The president noted that the forthcoming visit to the USSR by Jiang Zemin, to be made in reply to Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to China in 1989, shows that Chinese-Soviet relations have entered a new phase.

Yang expressed hope that friendly relations between the two nations, the communist parties and the armed forces of China and the Soviet Union would be developed further.

During the meetings between Yazov, Li and Yang, the sides exchanged opinions of issues of mutual interest.

On completing the five-day visit to China, Yazov departed from Beijing for Moscow today. [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1505 GMT on 7 May adds: "At the capital's airport, Yazov was seen off by Colonel General Xu Xin, deputy chief of the General Staff of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, and other Chinese commanders. USSR Ambassador to China N.N. Solovyov was among those seeing him off."]

Jiang Zemin Cited on Upcoming Moscow Visit

LD0305125391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1205 GMT 3 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Oreshin]

[Text] Beijing, 3 May (TASS)—China is ready to develop relations of good-neighborliness and friendship with the Soviet Union, based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistance. As reported by XINHUA, Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, stated this today in a conversation with Yasuhiro Nakasone, former prime minister of Japan, who is in Beijing on a visit. My visit to the USSR, added the leader of the Chinese communists, is being carried out in reply to the visit by M.S. Gorbachev to China in 1989.

In the current international situation, which Jiang Zemin describes as "uneasy," China will continue to conduct an independent and peace-loving foreign policy. The PRC, continued the Chinese leader, is in favor of the creation of a new international order in which there will not be interference in the affairs of other countries, and in which all states, large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor, will enjoy equal rights.

Observer Says Military Cooperation 'Necessary'

OW0705183191 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 7 May 91

[Station observer Alekseyev commentary; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] The Chinese press has pointed out that Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov's visit to China, the first of its kind in the history of the two countries' relations, shows that the Soviet Union and China are attaching importance to their military relations. Station observer Alekseyev points out:

Under the present conditions, cooperation in this aspect is obviously necessary. It is necessary to finally eliminate confrontation on the border areas of the two countries. It was decided at the Soviet-Chinese summit two years ago that negotiations on this problem should begin as soon as possible after the summit. Today, it is reasonable to say that much work in this aspect has been done. First, a draft treaty for solving specific problems in this aspect has been worked out. Exchanges of military visits have been carried out in accordance with the agreement on reducing and strengthening the mutual trust of both sides' border forces. Negotiations have been carried out in Moscow and Beijing on a rotational basis. Marked progress has been achieved. At the same time, the Soviet

Union has adopted a series of unilateral measures to withdraw a large number of troops from areas bordering on China. The Soviet Union has reduced 200,000 troops in its Asian part, including 120,000 troops in the Far East. In addition, all Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Mongolia.

The Soviet Union greatly appreciates China's decision to unilaterally reduce its troop strength by 1 million men, including along the Soviet-Chinese border areas. An important part of Soviet-Chinese military cooperation is the solution of difficult problems left over by history. Negotiations on these problems are progressing smoothly. Approximately 90 percent of the 7,500-km common boundary has been defined. Here, I want to particularly point out the role played by the military cartographers of the two countries. Cooperating closely, they have made many boundary maps, which will be used in the final demarcation of the national boundary of the two countries. Therefore, military cooperation is a kind of cooperation aimed at improving good-neighborly relations between the Soviet Union and China. I believe Yazov's visit to China will promote this kind of cooperation further.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

SRV Premier Discusses Ties With Gorbachev

PM0805104191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Talks in Kremlin"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev received Do Muoi, chairman of the Vietnamese Council of Ministers, in the Kremlin 7 May.

Mutual satisfaction was expressed with the state of Soviet-Vietnamese relations, which are underpinned by long-standing traditions of friendship between the two countries' peoples. Emphasis was placed on the mutual interest in increasing the potential of bilateral cooperation—above all its progressive new forms. Problems associated with the situation in Southeast Asia were touched on briefly.

The conversation was marked by amicability and mutual understanding.

Participating in the meeting were USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov and also Nguyen Manh Cam, SRV ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Meets Pavlov

LD0705194391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1821 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 7 May (TASS)—The Soviet Union is in solidarity with the constructive steps of Vietnam and countries in Indochina aimed at a most rapid settlement of the conflict situation around Cambodia. This was stated today by Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov during a meeting with Do Muoi, his colleague from Vietnam. The sides stressed the importance of the settling of this problem opening up a way to a further improvement of the situation in Southeast Asia, establishing durable peace in the region and stability and good-neighborly cooperation.

In the view of the sides, a most rapid normalization of Soviet-Chinese and Vietnamese-U.S. relations would promote an improvement in the political climate in the Asia-Pacific region.

The heads of the two governments also discussed profoundly the state of and prospects for Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation in various spheres.

Meets Lukyanov

LD0705043191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1502 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 6 May (TASS)—Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, today received Do Muoi, chairman of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Council of Ministers, who is in Moscow on a working visit at the invitation of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

An exchange of information on the political and socioeconomic situations in both countries took place during the course of a friendly conversation.

During discussion of issues of Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation, the necessity for preserving and increasing the accumulated potential for mutual links and for renewing the legal basis for accelerated development of new forms of economic interaction for the good of the two peoples was stressed.

SRV's Nguyen Van Linh To Visit USSR

LD0705171191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1531 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 7 May (TASS)—It has been officially announced here today that, by mutual arrangement, Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Vietnamese Communist Party, will pay a brief working visit to the Soviet Union within the near days.

Commentary on Scheduled Inter-Cambodian Dialogue

BK0805030091 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1200 GMT 6 May 91

[Commentary by Oleg Alekseyev]

[Text] Indonesia is prepared to accommodate the members of the Cambodian Supreme National Council [SNC] from 2-4 June. This is a press release issued by Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas. In view of this, our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev, has the following comments:

As such, the inter-Cambodian dialogue, which has been in the doldrums during the last few months, will likely be resumed. All the Cambodian parties have made known their acceptance to meet again in Jakarta according to the schedule announced by Ali Alatas.

I wish to particularly take note of the meeting-related efforts displayed by Indonesia and France, the cochairmen of the Paris International Conference on Cambodia. With the endeavor to create the most favorable conditions for the resumption of the inter-Cambodian meeting, the cochairmen and the UN secretary general jointly put forth an important initiative in April: They launched an appeal to all the contending Cambodian parties calling for the implementation of a cease-fire beginning from 1 May until the conclusion of the talks to be held within the SNC framework. The call has been endorsed by the Phnom Penh government and the Cambodian opposition group, including the warmongering Khmer Rouge.

Along with this, Phnom Penh has expressed hope that in case the opposition group agrees, the cease-fire would be observed on a permanent basis. All concerned states—chiefly the Soviet Union and China—have at the drop of a hat voiced their support for the truce, which is a condition of vital importance for promoting and making the proposed inter-Cambodian meeting a success. However, the peace campaign calling for observing the truce from 1 May onward—if meticulously observed—has not yet been implemented so far. On this issue, the international community has focussed its attention on a letter that the head of the Cambodian Government, Comrade Hun Sen, has conveyed to the French and Indonesian Governments and the UN secretary general. In the letter, Comrade Hun Sen has presented a variety evidence demonstrating that the Cambodian opposition, despite its announced pledge, has not effected the cease-fire yet. The Cambodian leader, through the letter, has voiced Phnom Penh's determination to respect the truce on condition that the other side agrees to do likewise. He has also proposed the immediate dispatch to Cambodia of observers from neutral countries to monitor the cease-fire.

By all accounts, on the eve of the resumed meeting in Jakarta, the achievement of the peace campaign in Cambodia remains the primary task, Oleg Alekseyev concluded.

Trade Relations With Philippines Reviewed

HK0805040491 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1400 GMT 7 May 91

[Mikhail Anatolyev commentary]

[Text] Trade between the Soviet Union and the Philippines is still low, because trade relations between both countries have been established only recently. To date, both countries still have not completely explored the means by which cooperation can be fully achieved. If Filipino businessmen were fully aware of Soviet trade possibilities, there would be no reason why trade relations could not flourish.

After a recent visit to Manila, this correspondent can say that trade relations should definitely be increased. The first trade treaty signed by the Soviet Union and the Philippines was in 1989, covering the mining, energy, agricultural, and irrigation industries. Some projects in these areas are already operating. One involves Soviet experts engaged in building a highway between Manila and San Fernando, Pampanga—a distance of 300 kilometers.

Other Soviet experts are operating coalmines in Mindanao, whose estimated capacity is 600,000 tons of coal yearly. Soviet experts are also involved in oil exploration.

Plans to set up an intergovernmental commission are being considered to strengthen trade and economic ties. An agricultural treaty is also in the works.

Exportation of machinery from the USSR to the Philippines resulted in 46 tractors being sent to the Philippines. And an agreement signed by both countries specifies the shipping of 100 trucks to Manila.

(Vela-Altmat), a Soviet firm, is negotiating now to open a branch office in Manila. The Philippine Armed Forces have successfully tested (Urals and Kamas) trucks, and 50 will be bought for $6 million.

Building rental and road construction works will further strenghthen ties between both countries.

(Straidermas Exports) is also negotiating with some Manila firms for the lease of Soviet construction machinery. The company is also considering setting up a branch office in Manila.

Joint ventures involving raw material purchases are also being considered, such as the shoe-making industry, and the logging industry in the Soviet Far East.

Such plans and ventures can only have a favorable effect on trade ties, and will certainly enhance relations between both countries.

Near East & South Asia

Bessmertnykh Leaves on Middle East Tour

LD0805063591 Moscow TASS in English 0629 GMT 8 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 8 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh left on a Middle Eastern tour this morning. He will visit Syria, Jordan, Egypt and Israel to try to facilitate a regional settlement.

He may also visit Lebanon and meet with Palestine Liberation Organisation leader Yasir 'Arafat.

Visit to Israel Previewed

PM0705133791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 91 p 3

[A. Vasilyev commentary: "Instead of a Forecast. "Why Bessmertnykh Is Traveling to Israel"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh is planning a diplomatic tour of the Near East during which he will visit Israel. The head of our foreign policy department had sought to sidestep a direct answer to the question of whether he intends to visit the Promised Land, but now it is no longer a secret: Yes, he does. He will be there 10 May.

There are many reasons for the interest which the Soviet foreign minister's visit to Israel is generating. First, this is partly to be explained by the complex history of Soviet-Israeli relations. For decades it was impressed on the world proletariat and national liberation movements in the "third world" that Zionism—the official political doctrine of the Jewish state—was the third head of a fire-breathing draggon, whose other two heads were U.S. imperialism and Chinese hegemonism. At the same time A.A. Gromyko, the USSR's legendary foreign minister, was... an honorary citizen of Israel. In recognition of the Soviet Union's services to the cause of the establishment of the state of Israel, the name of "Mister No" is carved next to the names of Israel's founding fathers on a memorial plaque in the Knesset (parliament) building.

Second, A.A. Bessmertnykh's trip is the first visit of a Soviet official representative of this rank since the inception of the state of Israel. And third, it is accepted diplomatic practice that a foreign minister visits a state with whom the country whom he represents has no diplomatic relations only when he intends to announce their establishment. In this case it would be a re-establishment, since diplomatic relations did exist between the USSR and Israel until 1967.

Meanwhile, there is no absolute certainty on this question as yet. Naturally, sooner or later Moscow will take this step, but specifically when and under what circumstances remains a matter for conjecture. And it is not only and not so much a matter of secrecy, as of the fact that in recent years a struggle between the champions of various viewpoints on this question has been waged in the top echelons of power in the Soviet Union. It is in progress even now, and in order to understand its essence it is necessary to look into the history of this problem and to study the alignment of forces on the Israeli political scene.

The essence of the Soviet Union's Near East policy from the late sixties to the beginning of perestroyka was set forth as a stance in L.I. Brezhnev's report to the 26th CPSU Congress: "As to the essence of this matter, we remain convinced that in order to achieve genuine peace in the Near East, the Israeli occupation of all Arab territories seized in 1967 must end. The Arab people of Palestine must be able to exercise their inalienable rights, including the establishment of their own state. It is necessary to ensure the security and sovereignty of all states of the region, including Israel. These are the fundamental principles. Details can, of course, be the subject of negotiations."

Apart from these officially stated principles at least three more factors determined the Soviet Union's conduct in the Near East. First, the confrontation with the United States. Its objective was to forestall the transformation of this region into a U.S. military bridgehead and at the same time to step up the Soviet military presence there.

The second factor was an ideological one. The beginnings of a socialist orientation in Egypt were interpreted by Moscow as a manifestation of the main trend of the processes in the Near East—the victorious march of socialist ideas and the swelling of the national liberation movement. Meanwhile, in the opinion of certain Arabists, there were, even a that time, diametrically opposite tendencies—a strengthening of capitalism and a weakening of the national liberation movement.

The third factor was the tendency to rely on one or two Arab states chosen in accordance with the two aforementioned principles. At one time Egypt was such a state, and subsequently the Kremlin "put its money on" Syria and Iraq.

However, even under the "old regime" there was a group of diplomats and Near East specialists who believed that it was necessary for the Soviet Union to maintain ties with all the states and real political powers of the region, irrespective of their programs and orientation. An experienced diplomat who worked in the Near East for a long time described to me how he had to argue the need for maintaining contacts not only with representatives of the Lebanese Communist Party but also with leaders of the Phalange at the CPSU Central Committee International Department.

After 1985 the confrontation with the United States and ideological subtleties began to recede into the background. Nobody was any longer questioning the need for the establishment of normal relations with all the states and political forces of the Arab world. However, there was no such clarity in respect of Israel. With the arrival of E.A. Shevardnadze at Smolenskaya Ploshchad [Foreign Ministry address], the specialists who define Soviet policy in the Near East split into two camps: Those who favored the re-establishment of diplomatic relations with Israel immediately, and those who argued that there was no call for haste so as not to damage our relations with the Arabs. At the same time each of these two sides is staking on specific political forces in Israel itself.

People often forget that Israel was created as a socialist state, that the first communes—kibbutzim—appeared in the Promised Land long before the "Avrora's" fateful salvo was fired, and that socialist ideas are popular in Israel to this day. The most influential political force which professes these ideas is the Labor Party, which is currently in opposition. I have been told by eyewitnesses

that Yitzhaq Rabin, deputy chairman of the Labor Party, has a red flag with a five-pointed star in his office just like any raykom secretary, and phrases such as "comrades have decided" and "comrades advise" are used by the party's supporters without any irony.

At present the Likud right-wing bloc of parties is in power. Its orientation is toward capitalism and the development of relations with the United States and Western Europe. And with the perestroyka-model of the Soviet Union.

In Moscow the alignment of forces is as follows: The grouping favoring the immediate restoration of diplomatic relations with Israel is willing to cooperate with Likud. Representatives of the bloc visiting Moscow are received at a higher level than Labor Party functionaries. That is natural since the bloc is the ruling bloc, our foreign policy has been deideologized, and the aim of the Soviet Union's top leadership is to establish mutually advantageous trade and economic relations with Israel and also to play a key role in the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which is impossible if the Kremlin has normal relations with only one of the sides.

It is interesting that the principle of deideologization of foreign policy proclaimed by Moscow is enabling Likud to establish contacts in the top echelons of power in our country, while the renunciation of building socialism—which is a principle of an ideological nature—is helping them to establish close ties with prominent representatives of the democratic movement in the Soviet Union. All this has given the opponents of an immediate rapprochement with Israel grounds to claim that the Likud right-wing bloc has been able to establish a kind of lobby in the USSR during the years of perestroyka, both in the official structures and among the opposition.

The supporters of a cautious approach to the question of the re-establishment of diplomatic relations with Tel Aviv point to the results of the 1988 elections when both Likud and the Labor Party won the same number of votes. Likud currently retains power only thanks to the fact that it was able to enlist the support of the "dregs"—several small political groupings. Some Soviet Near East specialists believe that a paralysis of power has emerged in Israel and that normalizing Soviet-Israeli relations right now would enable the right-wing Likud bloc to gain a large number of additional points in its struggle with the Labor Party.

In Moscow there are at least two political forces which do not favor this. The first is the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee, and specifically its International Department. As far as I can tell from the utterances of its staffers in a confined circle, the words "struggle against imperialism and international Zionism" are not meaningless as far as they are concerned. It is true that the Labor Party are also Zionists, but minus "imperialism"...

The second force are the Near East pragmatists concerned about the prospect of a deterioration in relations with the Arabs, and they have pointed out the difference in the approach to the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict between Likud and the Labor Party. The Labor Party is distinguished by a softer, more moderate stance; it was the Labor Party which proclaimed the principle "territories in exchange for peace," which implies a return of the occupied territories to the Arabs in exchange for their promise not to attack Israel. As for the Likud leaders, they will not hear of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories. At the same time Likud is encouraging the construction of Israeli settlements on occupied territories. Likud's intransigence and hardline stance is resulting in a gradual change in its favor of the position of the United States, and along with it also of the position of the Soviet Union.

The Moscow supporters of the immediate restoration of diplomatic relations with Tel Aviv insist that this step will enable the Soviet Union to play a more important role as mediator in a Near East settlement. In the opinion of the apologists of a cautious aprroach Moscow would do better... to withdraw of its own accord from participating in this process. They take the following view: The contradictions between the Jews and the Arabs are not just political but also religious, which makes the settlement of the conflict impossible in the foreseeable future. Consequently, it is advisable to keep out of it and to proceed solely from considerations of economic advantage for the Soviet Union in Near East policy. They emphasize at the same time that trade, economic, scientific, and technical ties with Israel are already flourishing even in the absence of diplomatic relations. Furthermore, large-scale assistance from Tel Aviv cannot be expected since all its reserves are being spent on resettling immigrants from the Soviet Union.

It is difficult to say which grouping's arguments will influence the results of A.A. Bessmertnykh's visit to Israel. The political processes in the Near East are complex and sometimes unpredictable. Sometimes it is difficult to forecast even what specific political steps the Soviet Union will take. After all, we sold missiles to Syria immediately after the war in the Persian Gulf! And that against the backdrop of talk about the need to limit arms deliveries to this "explosive region," and despite the fact that Syria can in no way be described as a friend of Israel, which has recently been the target of Iraqi Scud missiles manufactured in the Soviet Union. So is it simply that the motherland needs hard currency and that all the Near East specialists' strategic considerations and tactical calculations have gone by the board? This may also happen with Israel; it is necessary to be prepared for anything.

Bessmertnykh Cited on Conference

PM0805095191 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No. 18, May 91 (Signed to Press 29 Apr 91) pp 18-19

[Special correspondent Galina Sidorova report: "USSR-United States: A Sip of Mineral Water Between Moscow

and Damascus. The USSR and the United States Are Planning a Near East Peace Conference. The Cochairmen Are Known. Are the Participants Ready?"]

[Excerpts] The U.S. secretary of state interrupted his third Near East tour in the last two months to meet his Soviet counterpart. The venue of the meeting between Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and James Baker was Kislovodsk. The city was chosen because of its location halfway between Moscow and Damascus, from where the secretary of state flew in, and taking into account the fact that he was due to fly to Israel after the talks. The main topic was the Near East conference and the invitation to the Soviet Union to cochair it. [passage omitted]

The persistence with which the Soviet cochairmanship of the future conference was pursued by the Americans—and also by the Arabs and Israel to a certain extent—indicates that they must have had their reasons. I think that, in this case, the interest can be attributed to several reasons: The recent "ideological wards" still count on us to a certain extent to this day. All parties to the conflict want to "balance" the U.S. influence in the region. The Americans, for their part, realize that they cannot get the Near East peace process moving by themselves and, moreover, quite sensibly want to prevent the USSR from developing an inferiority complex which, once it gets hold, could pose a danger for those around it.

I got the impression that recently Moscow has been playing a smaller role in Near East affairs. Is that so?

"Some experts," A. Bessmertnykh said, "advised me—as soon as the news of Baker's Near East trip was released—to mount my charger and gallop over there. This is another way of playing a role. It does have its advantages, the effect of presence. Should the need arise, a gallop could ensue. But I am no advocate of show-off diplomacy, that if Baker is over there we must also be over there. He is probing the ground. I am not lagging behind. I assume that, in this case, restraint would be more important for Soviet diplomacy. The Americans have not acted in isolation from us. We have jointly worked out many issues. Let alone the fact that we have had our own contacts with the Egyptians, the Syrians, the Palestinians, and Israel. Now I am indeed planning to travel to the Near East, but this time I will be taking a different baggage, a clear-cut concept. I have a better idea of the limitations of what is possible, of the scope available for maneuvering..."

The world community has been trying to tackle the Near East conundrum for several decades. There was even an attempt at settlement under joint Soviet-U.S. auspices. At that time, however—in Geneva in 1973—each of the cochairmen worked with "his own" participants.

A different situation prevails now for the first time. The reason, in my view, lies in the deideologization of the conflict. In any case, an example is being set by the cochairmen.

I asked the minister whether there will be any division of labor: What will be done by us, and what by the Americans?

A. Bessmertnykh. We and they alike intend to work with all participants. Our task as cochairmen is not to impose our own concepts but to use them to help the interested parties get together and embark on a joint quest for accords. Both we and the Americans proceed from the premise that the interests of all states, including the Palestinians, must be taken into account. We and they alike believe that the process must incorporate both a conference and bilateral talks. We and they alike proceed from the premise that Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 underlie the process. Of course, certain details have yet to be worked out. But this is not a bad basis for joint work.

[Sidorova] How do you perceive the conference's first steps?

A. Bessmertnykh. I assume that, to start with, all parties will come together with the cochairmen and will outline their approaches toward the tasks facing the conference. They will then break into working groups on bilateral and global problems. The Palestinian question is one of the main issues that must be resolved. We must first arrive at an interim, and then a final solution to the Palestinian problem.

The following scenario is also possible. From the very start, the conference will be essentially international because we, the Americans, and probably the Europeans will be involved in it. But the first stage may be linked with the Palestinians and Israel—bilateral talks between them, as well as talks between Israel and the Arab states. And the final stage could be an international conference which would ratify the settlement and resolve questions going beyond the framework of bilateral interests. All this still has to be worked out. The important point now is to get the train on the tracks and run along with it...

[Sidorova] Does Israel still insist on the resumption of diplomatic relations between our countries as a condition for Soviet cochairmanship of the conference?

A. Bessmertnykh. Israel would like that. But our position is this: No preconditions for cochairmanship. The Americans and we cochaired the Near East conference in 1973. At that time we did not even have consular relations with Israel, let alone diplomatic relations. And one more point. We are approaching a normalization of relations with Israel. As soon as we get onto the tracks of settlement and Israel becomes part of it, we will have no grounds at all for not resuming relations with it. The certain restraint shown by Israel during the Persian Gulf crisis indicates that this country is showing greater realism in politics. I would say that the cochairmanship question comes after the question of resumption of relations with Israel.

[Sidorova] Does this mean that relations will be resumed?

A. Bessmertnykh. Let us wait and see. I may have additional contacts with Israeli leaders. I think that we will know shortly... [Bessmertnykh ends]

Both the Soviet minister and the secretary of state are aware of the burden they have taken on: To bring around the same table not just two but a whole group of participants with conflicting interests. They all have their own suspicions and fears. They are all shouting. Nobody talks to anybody else. Each one thinks he is right. Even defining the composition of conference participants is a problem. More likely than not, they will be the main Arab countries bordering on Israel, Israel itself, and the cochairmen. The possibility of European and UN participation evokes ambivalent feelings. The Arab countries themselves stand on different positions regarding the conditions for their participation. The conference's legal basis and the form of Palestinian participation in it are unclear. How can all this be reconciled? It is not surprising that not a single expert would be bold enough to guess at a time for the forum's start.

"This is one of the most protracted conflicts," the Soviet minister said. "Positions have become axioms. It is a matter of great complexity to shift axioms. Stereotypes have become as heavy as lead."

According to A. Bessmertnykh, much in the past was logically harmonious but practically unfeasible. Today's task is to get our positions down to earth. [passage omitted]

I asked the secretary of state:

"Do you have the feeling that today the conference cochairmen are more interested in an early start than the participants?"

J. Baker. I have no such impression. I have already said on several occasions that nobody can impose peace on the Near East. Whoever the conference cochairmen might be, it is unlikely to prove successful and, moreover, will not even be held at all until the parties to the conflict sense a real desire for peace. My impression from this trip is that such a desire does exist. The decisions that will have to be made are very hard and tough. This is why they have not been tackled for so many years. But they will never be made unless we show perseverance. I am deeply convinced that now is the best chance for this... [Baker ends] [passage omitted]

Israeli Consul on Bessmertnykh Visit

LD0705173691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1617 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow, 7 May (TASS)—Arye Levin, Israel's consul-general in the USSR, has called the trip to the Middle East by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR minister of foreign affairs, which starts tomorrow, "exceptionally important." During the trip the Soviet minister will also visit Israel. "This is the first visit to our country by a head of the Soviet foreign policy department since the time of the founding of the State of Israel. The first, and exceptionally important—although our countries do not yet have full diplomatic relations," said Arye Levin today in an interview with a TASS correspondent.

In the view of the consul-general, the visit to Israel will permit the Soviet minister, despite his short stay in the country, to get acquainted with the views of various circles on problems of a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, and will give a new impetus to bilateral relations.

Talking about the possible reestablishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries, the consul-general said: "We are ready for this; it is up to the Soviet side."

On the problem of the emigration of Soviet Jews to live permanently in Israel, Arye Levin said: "We do not intend to limit the scale of departures. In different months of the year the number of people leaving can vary. It is difficult to predict." In his words, 200,000 Soviet Jews left for Israel last year.

Churkin on Ties With Israel

PM0805081591 Moscow TRUD in Russian 8 May 91 p 3

[Interview with Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, by correspondent E. Alekseyev; date, place not given; first paragraph is TRUD introduction: "Not All At Once?"]

[Text] At the request of many of the newspaper's readers and in connection with the visit which USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh is commencing to the Near East region our correspondent E. Alekseyev put this question to Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration:

[Alekseyev] Is it proposed to establish diplomatic relations with Israel?

[Churkin] Of course, the fact that we do not have diplomatic relations with Israel, having been broken off by our country, as is known, in 1967, cannot be considered normal. For diplomatic relations exist precisely in order to resolve those problems that might arise between two countries or in international life. The existence of diplomatic relations does not in itself signify approval for a particular country's policy.

Of course, such a statement certainly does not oblige us to restore diplomatic relations with Israel this minute. The history of the Near East and of our relations with that country has been a difficult one, and the present situation in and around the region is unique and complex. Our ties with Israel have been developing quite well of late. The matter has gone as far as the opening of consulates general of the Soviet Union and Israel in Tel Aviv and Moscow respectively. It is obvious that the

logic of events, if we hope for their positive development, must also lead at some time to the establishment of full-scale diplomatic relations. But we view such a step in the context of the process of a Near East settlement. In our view there is now a real opportunity to launch the process of a Near East settlement and to convene a peace conference on the Near East, whose cochairmen would be the USSR and the United States (we have a definite mutual understanding with the Americans on this score).

In recent months the Soviet Union has maintained active contacts with all the sides involved in one way or another in the Arab-Israeli conflict. An important new stage in our efforts in this direction will be the visit which USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh is beginning to the region 8 May. He will visit Syria, Jordan, Israel, Egypt, and, possibly, Lebanon. A new meeting between A.A. Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker is expected in Cairo.

The results of this mission will give us a clearer idea of the prospect of making progress toward peace in the Near East and, thus, of resolving in practice the question of establishing diplomatic relations with Israel.

Clarification of Soviet Mideast Policy Urged

91UF0709A Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 16, Apr 91 pp 19-20

[Article by Andrey Ostalskiy: "Why Moscow Is Silent"]

[Text] The activity of Washington's diplomats promises some progress in Arab-Israeli relations. But Soviet diplomats are once again on the sidelines.

While U.S. Secretary of State James Baker is headed for the third time in the past few weeks to the Near East, attempting to urge on the quest for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, Soviet diplomacy is remaining so doggedly silent that many people are beginning to wonder whether the USSR has a Near East policy.

Or is Moscow truly "not concerned with others' problems" when its own are so acute? There is, I believe, a grain of truth in this, but if the USSR remains a great power, by definition, at least (a permanent member of the UN Security Council with one of the biggest nuclear weapon arsenals), it continues to bear responsibility for the state of affairs in the world. The more so in that the Soviet Union has primordially been connected to the Near East by special relationships. Israel appeared on the world map thanks to a considerable extent to the support of the USSR, but subsequently the vector of this support changed direction, thanks to which the Arab countries were able to pursue political and military confrontation with the Jewish state. Now, however, with the onset of the era of the "new thinking," Moscow should decide on the side of who and what it is in a most puzzling and most dangerous and insoluble world conflict. But Moscow remains silent....

I will venture to express the supposition that this indecisiveness has been brought about largely by the resignation of Eduard Shevardnadze. Even his adversaries have to acknowledge that under him Soviet foreign policy was clear and consistent. That this consistency was to far from everyone's liking is another matter....

So what is happening in this new era in the Near East?

Taking advantage of the positive inertia that has come about following the war in the Persian Gulf, in the course of which many Arab countries and Israel suddenly found themselves "on the same side of the barricades," as it were, the United States is now attempting to continue the progress in the direction of Arab-Israeli reconciliation. Many problems remain, and the Palestinian problem is the most important of them. Neither the Palestinians nor the Israelis are prepared, as before, for the mutual compromise toward which Washington is pushing them.

The Israelis reject the sponsorship of the United Nations, fearing that under the aegis of the international organization a conference could become an empty talking-shop and shooting gallery for the propaganda shelling of Tel Aviv.

Egypt and Syria prefer the active role of the United Nations in a conference in order to insure themselves against the need for unilateral concessions, but are not, apparently, as categorical as previously. A multitude of arguments are evoked by the question of who should represent the Palestinians: the PLO, whose leadership damaged its reputation by siding with Saddam Husayn, or some others, even if adhering in principle to PLO positions. Many questions, but some glimmer of hope, some opportunity for mutual understanding, has, it seems, suddenly emerged. And now is the time, it might have seemed, for the Soviet Union to intervene and offer new initiatives, taking advantage of its traditional ties to the Arabs and its great authority in Israel. But no, Soviet diplomacy is hanging back, leaving the Americans opportunities for maneuver. Why? Can it really not formulate its own program?

But what is meant by "certainty of position"? Should it be "pro- Arab" or "pro-Israeli"? What development of events in the Near East might correspond to the USSR's state interests? Eduard Shevardnadze believed that in the present situation the Soviet Union needs first and foremost peace and stability in this explosive region and an opportunity to establish de-ideologized, mutually profitable and, therefore, the most durable relations both with the Arabs and with their enemy, even if it is necessary for the sake of this to sacrifice the "special relationships" with a couple of radical regimes cultivated by the former, totalitarian Moscow, or agree to a cutback in Soviet arms supplies to the region.

The opposite viewpoint, on the other hand, is that such a price is too high and that there is nothing all that dreadful in a continuation of the confrontation with the

Americans in the Near East, even if this jeopardizes Soviet-American relations as a whole.

It is here that the dividing line runs—it is wholly a question of a differing interpretation of the national and state interests of the USSR, and this interpretation, in turn, is determined by a differing view of the future of the Soviet Union.

Specialists believe that the Soviet Foreign Ministry has reached the conclusion concerning the need for a resumption of full diplomatic relations with Israel in order that the USSR might play the part of intermediary in a settlement of the Near East conflict. What kind of intermediary is it, they say, that can talk only with one side? But Moscow, apparently, simply cannot bring itself to take this step. Why not? Informed sources explain this by the fact that such important decisions are made not in the Foreign Ministry but higher up. And the resultant between two lines—"globalist" and "Arabist"—is being sought there. As a result, neither....

I am convinced that only certainty of position makes it possible to pursue an effective foreign policy. As far, however, as Shevardnadze's policy is concerned, it reflected, in my opinion, his view (and the view of considerable numbers of our society) of the new reality. We could, of course, disagree with him and attempt to return to the approved standards of past decades. This also could have an effect for a certain length of time. But attempts to insert old "semi-corrections" in new policy merely make it half-baked and indecisive and, consequently, doomed to many failures.

Ties With Saudi Arabia Said Getting 'Closer'

PM0705141991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 91 First Edition p 5

[V. Belyakov report under the "Meridians of Cooperation" rubric]

[Excerpts) Jeddah-Riyadh-Cairo, May—"That is our plot there," Aleksandr Sergeyevich Zasypkin said, pointing to a spacious plot of land. "That is where we will build the Soviet Embassy complex."

We are in the so-called diplomatic quarter of the Saudi capital, where foreign missions are concentrated. It is an entire settlement on the outskirts of Riyadh, not far from the king's palace.

Diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Saudi Arabia were originally established 65 years ago, in February 1926. But they were to all intents and purposes broken off 12 years later, and were reestablished only last September.

In December the two states exchanged diplomatic missions. Initially they were not very big, and were occupied with organizational questions more than with political ones. A five-man Soviet Embassy team headed by Charge d'Affaires A.S. Zasypkin stayed in a hotel, looking for a suitable villa while their own building is being built. Today the organizational period is virtually over. The USSR ambassador—44-year-old Arabist G.P. Tarasov—arrived in Riyadh and assumed his duties at the beginning of April. Contacts with the Saudi Government and with the kingdom's business circles are becoming closer all the time.

It must be said that the local businessmen showed interest in our country straightaway. Despite the oversaturation of the Saudi market with goods from all over the world, it turns out there is room for Soviet output too. Provided, of course, that it is good. [passage omitted]

USSR Consul General L.Kh. Ismailkhodzhayev arrived in Jeddah at the beginning of April, and organization of the consulate general's normal work is not far away. June will see the beginning of the season of pilgrimage by Muslims to Mecca, which is situated near Jeddah, and many of our own believers will probably be among the pilgrims. Last year there were mass pilgrimages from the USSR for the first time. The number of visitors to Mecca came to around 1,500 people. A special consular group even had to be dispatched to Jeddah for this period, in case our fellow countrymen needed help. This season the consulate general will assume these functions.

It is noteworthy that the first steps in the development of Soviet-Saudi relations took place during a severe political crisis, and even a war, in the region. The Saudis, according to my interlocutors, duly appreciated the fact, for example, that when the Iraqis began the missile bombardment of the Saudi capital, Soviet diplomats, unlike a whole series of others, did not leave.

Implications of 'Kurdish Problem' Examined

91UF0708A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 May 91 p 3

[Article by A. Mursaliyev: "The Kurdish Card";]

[Text] *Iraq's Revolutionary Command Council has decided to extend by one month "full amnesty" for the Kurds. This decision extends to all Kurds within Iraq and outside. Nonetheless, the Kurdish problem remains. And it is urgent for more than just Iraq.*

The Kurdish card is being played for the third time since the start of the century in the big game in the Near East, it would seem.

Who is playing this card this time?

Syria—the state that is Iraq's twin. The same party (Ba'th), the same system, almost the same relations with the USSR. In power— our friend President Hafiz al-Asad, general secretary and general, who harbors a profound and lasting hatred of his twin-neighbor. These feelings are mutual, incidentally. Al-Asad has already benefited from the conflict. Two months and 11 days after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait the 30,000-strong Syrian

Army contingent in Lebanon smashed General Michel 'Awn, who had been supported by Saddam, and entered East Beirut. Al-Asad now controls more than two- thirds of Lebanese territory. But with Kurdistan the question is somewhat more complex. Best leave well alone: al-Asad himself has 1 million Kurds in the northeast of the country. And, having joined in the game, he stands to lose a great deal.

Iran, which endured the long bloody war with Iraq and has no love for Saddam, nonetheless evaluated the military operations of the allies as imperialist aggression. Dire forebodings from the possible consequences of the disintegration of Iraq prevent it from rejoicing in the smashing of its old enemy. Tehran is far more interested in the success of the Shi'ites in the south than of the Sunni Kurds in the north, who have over the past 50 years done it so many bad turns. Prior to the war with Iraq, the Iranian Army was mounting extensive combat operations against its Kurdish insurgents. And then, a Kurdish state formation alongside could exert an undesirable influence on the 6 million Iranian Kurds.

Turkey, in the southeast of which live approximately 10 million Kurds, is not enraptured at the prospect of the emergence of a neighboring Kurdish state either. Turkey's southeast has always been its most vulnerable point. Almost all Turkish presidents, from Ataturk on, have run into the problems of this region. The reasons are not so much Kurdish separatism as the economic backwardness of Southeast Anatolia. President Turgut Ozal has decided to put an end to this at a stroke, which goes under the name of the "Southeast Anatolia Project" (GAP). It is planned within its framework to build 21 dams, 17 power stations, and a vast network of irrigation canals. In his opinion, the realization of this project will contribute to the continued expansion of Turkish capital onto Asian markets, raise the economy of the region, and remove the Kurdish problem in Turkey. This plan has evoked the greatest objections in Baghdad since it is a question of the upper reaches of the Tigris and Euphrates—Iraq's rivers of life.

The Kurdish problem concerns our country also, two republics, at least: Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Armenia, where, incidentally, a Kurdish newspaper is published and where there has for many years been a kind of Kurdish scientific and cultural center, recently issued a statement in support of the Kurdish movement. True, only the Yazidi Kurds remain in Armenia itself, the Muslim Kurds having left this land in the wake of the Azerbaijanis.

Azerbaijan, on the other hand, is convinced that the Kurdish card in the USSR is being played by Armenia. The point being that the areas that in the 1920's were a part of the Kurdish Autonomous Okrug are located between the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and Armenia. And in the event of a restoration of Kurdish autonomy, Yerevan would attempt to make it a bridge between ethnically homogeneous Armenia and Nagornyy Karabakh, pushing the border, more precisely, the line of the front, with Azerbaijan inside the territory of its neighbor. Left in the remote rear, it would be easy to isolate Nakhichevan. But this would depend on the position primarily of the Kurds themselves, who (those living in Azerbaijan, in any event) manifestly do not aspire to an alliance with Armenia.

West Europe

Gorbachev, Mitterrand Hold News Conference

LD0605220991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1827 GMT 6 May 91

[News conference by President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and French President Francois Mitterrand from the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Moscow on 6 May; Mitterrand remarks in French with superimposed Russian translation—live]

[Text] [Gorbachev] Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. President Francois Mitterrand and I apologize for having slightly run out of the time set aside for the talks. We were forced to extend so that, having completed our discussion, we could come to a meeting with you. The visits of the leaders of the Soviet Union and France, the mutual contacts, talks, and meetings are already a run of the mill affair. They lack sensation, some outward decorations and some symbols, but they still, I assure you, always remain events—and I hope not only for our bilateral relations, but also for politics worldwide.

The present meeting is remarkable as, first of all, it is taking place within a certain context, which is connected in my opinion with two important aspects, maybe more, but I will note the first—I believe it is necessary and important to speak about this—this meeting is taking place on the eve of 10 May, when the 10th anniversary of Mr. Mitterrand in the post of president of France will be celebrated. This, I think, is an event not just for France, for the French people and the Europeans, but also for the world, as the stay of Mr. Mitterrand in the post of president of France is connected with very important periods in restructuring international relations and European politics and in the development of France itself. The contribution made by Mr. President in all these directions, I think, should be appreciated and will be appreciated.

We will not wait for history to arrange all this. As contemporaries we can say that this is a considerable contribution. On the eve of this date, I welcome Mr. President, taking advantage of this occasion of our meeting here in the Soviet Union. It is important that today, both in world politics and on the European continent, we are going through a very important period requiring intensive intellectual work on the part of politicians, scientists, and specialists of various branches of knowledge, and our press. Perhaps that which is

happening during these months, at this time, what decisions we will make, and as far as perestroyka is concerned, and as far as European policy is concerned, and as far as how we will extricate ourselves from the crisis—from the Persian crisis [as heard]—is concerned, all this creates a special context for our present meeting with the French president. Therefore our conversations are very important on all these aspects of policy. Naturally we had a thorough discussion about our bilateral relations, in the context of these changes.

I have mentioned this more than once. From our point of view, Soviet-French dialogue and cooperation is of unique value in world policy, primarily in European policy. Proceeding from this, I think that you understand that today we held a necessary conversation. I am satisfied with the way we exchanged views and talked. We discovered a great similarity of views, approaches, and our appraisals regarding all those issues that I mentioned in my brief opening remarks. This gives me great satisfaction.

I greet Mr. President here, in our country. Now I give him the floor. Then we will be ready to answer your question.

[Mitterrand] I would like to thank Mr. Gorbachev for his hospitality. I would also like to thank him for the kind words with which he was kind enough to address me in connection with the anniversary of my term in the office of president. Of course, every day is an anniversary for us. It is hardly necessary to single out this anniversary more than any other. Nevertheless, I am rather touched by what was said by President Gorbachev, who expressed not just his own opinion but that of the whole country—a great country—when speaking about my mandate. He spoke with a feeling of friendship, friendship that I would like to preserve at any price in the relations between our two countries.

What did we speak about? You have just been informed that rather crucial events are taking place. We also spoke about specific European events connected with the CSCE structure and the steps taken since the Paris conference, with drafts relating to the European Confederation and the life of the community of 12 countries. We also spoke about economic cooperation in all spheres. We spoke about comprehensive links and bilateral links. You can verify all these by touching upon this or that direction, by touching upon the results of our meeting. If we are the ones to do this, it will be a very long conversation, and I still have to return to France.

We also talked about the consequences of the war in the Gulf. We spoke about the first steps that were undertaken with the purpose of trying to settle the serious conflict that continues there, in particular the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. We also touched upon the situation in Lebanon, without forgetting, of course, the issues that are directly connected with the war—that is, the events that are taking place now in the south and in the north of Iraq, which concern the life of the Kurds and the Shiites.

In short, we spoke about things that concern us directly and those spheres where our diplomatic efforts can be united and where they can complement each other. We are ready—at least, I am—to answer and to satisfy your curiosity.

Thank you once again, Mr. President. Such talks have become a part of our meetings, which, in their turn, have become a ritual and give us a chance to have the satisfaction of meeting here. This is not the first time. Since 1985, the year Mr. Gorbachev came to Paris and opened a whole series of similar bilateral meetings and conferences, there have been meetings of a similar nature with other main states.

I hope this meeting will not be our last one. In any case, we intend to continue to jointly discuss those issues that are of interest to our two countries in this world in which we have a role to play—one which has been allocated to us by the history of our two countries—and we do it with a desire to understand each other and to come to an agreement. This is a very important approach for us. That is what I want to say by way of introduction, Mr. President. Like you, I am ready to answer questions.

[Unidentified reporter] MUSAWWAR journal, Egypt. My question is to both presidents, if possible. How do you evaluate the idea of the convocation of an international conference to resolve the Near East problem, and what is the possibility of the involvement of the PLO in this process? Finally, do you recognize the right of the Palestinians to create their own independent state?

[Gorbachev] Inasmuch as the question is an easy one, then I offer...[changes thought] I will ask the president to take the floor.

[Mitterrand] I take it with pleasure. Unfortunately, this is a very long question. It has been under consideration for a long time at international conferences. For a long time the question has been posed about how to get out of this constant conflict in which Israel and its neighbors have found themselves for such a long time. There are various views here. What kind of conference indeed? In any case, people speak of an international conference. Mr. Shamir speaks of a regional conference, but this is an international conference simply composed of fewer participants compared with the conference that Mikhail Gorbachev and I proposed about five or six years ago.

But in essence, one must not forget that when [word indistinct] was created, Israel (?out of a package of decisions) of the United Nations, and I gave a very positive reception and attitude to this decision, the United Nations, within the scope of the very same resolution, envisaged the creation of a Palestinian state. I have constantly repeated to my Israeli friends—I call them friends, even when they doubt this—I said that one must not sit on the sidelines of the serious problem concerning the creation of a homeland, their own homeland, where they might create state structures—a state according to their own judgement.

There has long been discussion of this, and the situation, in essence, is not changing, but nevertheless, it is evolving because the correlation of forces and events surrounding this problem unfolding [words indistinct] because ultimately we return to one and the same topic, to one and the same procedure: How is this problem to be settled peacefully, once and for all. I will not speak on behalf of President Gorbachev, of course, although as far as I understand our positions are very close; they are not identical. But as previously, (?the sides) consider themselves close. This conference, naturally, with the involvement of the United Nations, lay at the base of the legal norms of the [words indistinct] diplomatic relations between the Israelis and Palestinians. The United Nations of course should take part—at least at the end of the process. As before, I feel that one must not depart from this logic, this reason, despite the numerous refusals from both sides; as before, I feel that this is the only way out. Of course, there is another way out—that of force. But who can wish for that?

[Gorbachev] I wish to confirm Mr. President's view that our positions on the very important, complex, and chronic conflict of the Near East are very close, very close. And this allows me to answer only briefly, to limit myself to a brief answer. Well, first of all, I think that what took place in the Persian Gulf showed us all again and again that we need to move more decisively along the path of solving the acute international conflict that the Near East conflict is, since protracting it can throw up similar or other acute situations more than once yet.

I confirm what Mr. President has said—that, as before, we are in favor of an international conference. It is now very important to bring into play the mechanism of such a process, and it can develop. Maybe at the first stage this conference will have one format; at the subsequent stage the format will be different and other problems will come to the surface, but without fail we must arrive at a solution of the most acute problems, including the Palestinian question and the creation of a Palestinian state. What has taken place recently represents for us merely an additional argument, confirming the correctness of our approach and position.

[Unidentified reporter in French] AFP. We know that internal Soviet problems have also been at the heart of your conversations. Have you discussed Armenia, and particularly the intervention by Soviet army units against the volunteers or the Armenian elements in the villages, which has led to the destruction of Armenian villages in Azerbaijan and today to the destruction of an Armenian village in Armenia?

[Gorbachev] Yes, we talked a lot about the situation in the Soviet Union. That occupied a considerable part of the time in our discussion. I thank Mr. President for the constant interest he is showing and for the solidarity with our affairs within the framework of the implementation of the political course toward perestroyka and the reform and renewal of our society. In informing the president of France, I presented a lot of data that characterize both the scale and the fundamental nature, the complexity and the dramatic nature of the processes that are taking place precisely at this period within the framework of reforming our society regarding both property relations and the political process, the reform of our multiethnic state, and other areas of our society's life. And included in this—also touched upon in specific terms was the acute situation that is taking place—I would say only that it is not in Armenia but in Azerbaijan, to be precise, on whose territory Nagorno-Karabakh is situated, an autonomous oblast where the native inhabitants are for the most part Armenians and where a conflict arose a long time ago that now has acquired acuteness of this kind. We have traversed a long and difficult path in the search for a political resolution of this conflict. We have made great efforts here, both the Supreme Soviet and the executive power and the corps of deputies; our scientific representatives and those of our artistic intelligentsia and representatives of other republics have also participated in this, in the quest for this process. For we are all troubled by this. The whole time, all the time the situation there brings us up against the kind of aggravation that ends up not just in upsetting the normal life of people in these two republics and especially in these border areas, but which is accompanied by grave consequences for the people.

People are perishing. There are thousands of refugees. Of the 500,000-plus Armenians living in Azerbaijan before the conflict, just over 200,000 remain. Three hundred thousand or something like that have left. In their turn 150-160,000 Azerbaijanis who were residing in areas of Armenia have also departed.

As a matter of fact, I do not know whether or not there are still Azerbaijanis in Armenia now; maybe, individual people, or some dozens or hundreds remain there. In other words, it is a tragedy, on the whole, it is a human tragedy for people. And our attitude is as follows: We are always trying to find approaches, but we are having great difficulties in achieving this. Nevertheless, there must be political ways to solve this problem. You know, all this political process, including restoring full autonomy with all its attributes and so on, comes up against the fact that it is impossible to implement these political measures in conditions when there are armed bandit groups terrorizing people, both Armenians and Azerbaijanis. In fact, attempts from one side or the other are literally perceived as betrayal. This, incidentally, is true about the Armenian guerillas and, to a certain extent, there are similar groups on the Azerbaijani side. In short, the point is that without first disarming and eliminating all these detachments, without making them comply with the requirements of the presidential decree, the political process will not develop there, and this will be accompanied by losses.

Well, when I went to the meeting with the president, I asked what had happened there. From March to May, in Nagorno-Karabakh and in suburban areas, there were 235 attacks and shootings. These all occurred this year. In March alone...[changes thought] even with January

and February, March, May—March-April-May. Of these, 153 were from the Armenian side, and 82 from the Azerbaijani side. Twenty Azerbaijanis and 10 Armenians were killed. There were 115 instances of the internal troops of the USSR, who are stationed there and who are controlling the situation, coming under fire. If they were not there, this would be a real war, slaughter. Nine people—soldiers of the internal troops—have been killed, and 15 people have been injured.

Because we found ourselves in this situation, it was deemed necessary to carry the fulfillment of the presidential decree through to the end, and disarm the illegal formations and seize their weapons. Incidentally, weapons from all over the world are being found there, from home-made weapons to modern flame-throwers, not to mention submachine guns, machine guns, armored vehicles, and so on. It is a serious situation and it must be relieved, otherwise this could take the form of events which could lead to much blood being shed, although so many lives have already been taken, and so many families and people's ways of life have been broken up.

Therefore, within the framework of the points of the constitution, the law and the presidential decree, this operation to disarm people is being carried out, built-up area by built-up area. Some people do not like it—those who want to gain political capital from this grave drama of the people and to exploit it even further. We cannot permit this to go on any further. Therefore, constitutional order must be restored and Nagorno-Karabakh's autonomy, with all its peculiar attributes, must be fully restored. Moreover, I think the Azerbaijani side intends to make it possible, in these conditions, to give this autonomy the kind of status whereby people feel concern and attention, and I think this is the one true path—to stand firmly on the positions of the constitution and to act. Especially since one cannot accuse the leadership of the country of not making efforts of a political nature. This was done from the very first day.

On the second day I had a chat with the representatives of Armenia; they included Zoriy Balayan, a current people's deputy, to whom I said: This whole process of growing enmity and anti-constitutional demands must be stopped.

This was not done. Decisions were adopted with regard to declaring Nagorno-Karabakh part of Armenia. Of course, this is a violation of the Union constitution and not just a violation of Azerbaijan's integrity. I said it then—and I truly regret that my words have come true—the consequences of this will be that we will create a calamity for hundreds of thousands of Azerbaijanis and Armenians living in Armenia and Azerbaijan. This is exactly how it happened. This is why we intend to adhere strictly to the law and to act within the framework of lawfulness. I have recently met and talked to one president and then the other president. Unfortunately, I did not manage to talk to both of them together. This also is characteristic of the condition the relations are in. Comrade Vezirov, who is president of Azerbaijan, assured me that he will make a statement on his return.

[Unidentified speaker] Mutalibov.

[Gorbachev] I beg your pardon, Comrade Mutalibov. Who did I say?

[Unidentified speaker] Vezirov.

[Gorbachev] Vezirov was the former chairman, secretary, my old friend. If you like to hint with your smile, I will immediately say to you that he is my old Komsomol friend. He is a very decent person, a good diplomat, a person who is devoted to democracy. This is my answer to you. Comrade Mutalibov, as far as I know, made a statement yesterday that the leadership of Azerbaijan guarantees safety to all those who decide to stay in these settlements. This is my answer to your question. Of course, with the proviso that the laws and the constitution will be observed. At the same time, there are people there who would like to leave in spite of one or another appeal. The Armenian side regards this as a forced deportation. It is true that one of the authorities' representatives describes this as a forced deportation and another telephones the country's government and leadership asking to assist in evacuating those who would like to leave, including women and children.

All in all, one must not play games and continue to play a political game using this grave tragedy of the people. It must be brought to a close in a lawful manner, upon a lawful basis. We must do this and bring it to an end, otherwise the road to peace will not only turn out to be lengthy and long but it can also turn out to be very bloody.

Well, I have tried to tell you about it, but it is a very painful question. It concerns us all. We are worried about it. Today this issue was examined at the Supreme Soviet session. I will limit myself to this. I hope that I have covered this in detail.

[Dmitriyev, in French with superimposed Russian translation] I am Vladimir Dmitriyev from the Vremya program. Mr. Mitterrand, my country's president has just referred to the 10th anniversary of your work in the supreme post of the French Republic. As far as Soviet-French relations are concerned, what is the most important decision that has been made by your government in these years, and what is the most disappointing decision? That is the first question. The second one is this: Are you satisfied with the results of these talks with Mr. Gorbachev on the economic level; have you been able to settle certain economic difficulties between the Soviet Union and France?

[Mitterrand] I will begin with the second question. The talks were very interesting. They should lead to the new decisions that both countries are striving toward. We talked in great detail about energy, agriculture, and food production. We also touched upon the cultural sphere.

Tomorrow we intend to deal with certain aspects connected with the direct contracts in the industrial field. There is a proper time for everything. We will certainly give a more detailed explanation somewhat later, but I will leave Moscow with a feeling that there is a further need to develop relations that have remained below a desireable level for a long time. Quite simply, you took me by surprise with your question. Of course, I must not sing my own praises now on my 10th anniversary—let others deal with that. At any rate, those who declare themselves to be my friends have spoken highly of a number of decisions. Those who would consider themselves to be my opponents have blamed me for a great deal. At any rate, relations have developed successfully. Let those who are interested in this date give their own assessment of it. As far as the best or the least successful decision, I do not know. There have been various decisions that had not been made before—decisions made nationally or internationally. These are decisions that require a most careful analysis. Perhaps I will answer your question next time, taking into account all the fine points and nuances. I would not dare now. I would not dare to give a definitive answer. At any rate, the most important and most interesting decision was the decision I made to come here.

[Matthew, in English] Janet Matthew, Canadian Radio, CBC. According to a TASS report of your meeting with [Rupert] Murdoch, you spoke of some kind of readjustment. What readjustment do you have in mind, and do you have any kind of feeling that the West is losing faith in you as a reformer? Who is threatening these achievements and who is threatening to return the world to a Cold War?

[Gorbachev] Yes, we had an interesting conversation with Mr. Murdoch yesterday. It is to me that you are putting the question, as I understand it, in connection with this? [voice assents] And, naturally, it extended to various problems, including the present situation, its chances, and its dangers. I would—since the conversation was a lengthy one, I would present the subject we covered in the following light—I would say that the chances for a restructuring of international relations and for a strengthening of the positive trends that have taken shape thanks to joint efforts by politicians of the present generation are still there; and, moreover, I am sure that in the final analysis these trends will gain strength. But we can already see that the new approach in world politics, or even new approaches, and first and foremost the political approach, which is taking the place of an approach through strength, and relying on force, is coming up against serious obstacles. This is understandable. This is an initial period, I would say even a transitional one; after one phase in international relations comes another. We are moving away from a Cold War, but all around we can see relics of this Cold War and that policy still with us, and they are being exploited and used quite considerably. Therefore the policy of the new thinking, whatever you like to call it, the new approaches in international politics are going through a serious test. And we must realize this. The common responsibility of those of us who have shaped this new course and the new approaches consists of preserving it and making it meaningful, so that this powerful tree has deep roots and no winds or shocks demolish it. But to do so we must be able to see the dangers.

I must say in connection with this, that in the press sometimes very quickly, and without proper responsibility, and not only in the press—often the press quotes politicians, and this would mean among politicians—certain events or this or that period are appraised and a sentence is passed. And if we treat in this way what we already possess—the initial capital which we today have only just formed, and which we are committed to building up—then great disappointments, but even more than that, great troubles await us. For it is on the basis of the new approaches in politics that the powerful processes which have gripped all countries have developed. If it is thought that any one of them has been left on the sidelines, then it has still not sorted itself out. These processes have gripped all countries, to one degree or another, all countries.

So the dangers lie in the fact that someone, analyzing at some private moment this or that instance or episode, or even event, including a dramatic event, should not make hasty conclusions and cast doubts on all that has been acquired. And what we have created in putting international relations onto new channels, onto new rails, entering—as all of us have said—a period of peaceful development.

It was here that there was talk about what you have seen in the Persian Gulf, what it is being shown, that in general at least part of both the politicians and the press are planting it in our path in order to provide arguments for those who did not want to move away from the Cold War at all. They lived pleasantly in those drafts, so to speak. It was not important how peoples felt. At the present time they are gleaning, seeking out arguments in the lessons of the Persian Gulf conflict. It turns out that force is needed, there is such an opinion, there are such judgements. It turns out that this is what one should occupy oneself with. Moreover, it turns out that one can hold the opinion of others in contempt. We'll cooperate with them, it's not that important really. Yes, and one can cast doubt on the role of the United Nations as well. You know, these are all very dangerous opinions, and therefore I must say that these are still just opinions. This is not some kind of political counter-course that has been formed. But it was time to mention this before it was too late.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, these judgements are of such a hasty nature. They can be found in our press as well, perhaps there are even more of them in the Soviet press, and they are to be found in the international press.

We will still spend a long time looking into things, and later history, other generations by then, will also investigate what is happening in the Soviet Union, and what significance it has for it, for Europe, and for the whole world. Today one can already say that what is happening is needed by us, is needed by Europe, and is needed by the whole world. And what is happening cannot happen easily and simply. To make hasty judgements and take upon oneself the ambition to announce that 300 million are incapable of sorting it all out and to hand out a prescription is a mistake. All the time within the country, and you know that, I warn against such people, that one must keep away from politicians who want to offer simple solutions to society. There is nothing to back up those simple solutions, neither a knowledge of the past, nor a knowledge of the current realities, nor knowledge regarding the forecast for the future, albeit the immediate one. These are frequently attempts to play on some kind of current events and to get some kind of political dividend. That is very dangerous.

I said at that time, when they told me I should recall one of the politicians and his warnings, I agreed and told Mr. Murdoch I would rather recall Winston Churchill, who said that a statesman differs from a politician in that the former thinks about the future and when discussing any problems, including current ones, counterposes it and ties it with those prospects, with those guidelines and with those aims that we are putting forward; while the politician is thinking about how he can be victorious and win the next election.

I am saying all this because it is very serious. Very profound changes, very crucial ones are taking place, and to issue through the press...to form the public consciousness of people...hasty judgements, and moreover to impose them without even having sorted them out in essence, this is dangerous now—both for the Soviet Union in the sense of perestroyka, and also within the scope of restructuring international relations. So you posed this question; it is so serious that I have not been able to get around it in only two or three words. In essence, it was to this that our whole conversation with Mr. Murdoch was devoted. So please forgive me my prolixity.

[Unidentified voice] A group of French journalists have arrived.

[French journalist] A question from the newspaper LIBERATION. Mr. Mitterrand, you received Boris Yeltsin a few weeks ago. Were the formal aspects of business discussed, or did you discuss matters in essence? How do you now evaluate the phenomenon of Yeltsin or the personality of Yeltsin? And Mr. Gorbachev, how do you...well do you regard the meeting between Mr. Mitterrand and Mr. Yeltsin favorably?

[Mitterrand] I did indeed meet Mr. Yeltsin; I received him. Incidentally, I have learned of quite strange appraisals of this meeting. First, Yeltsin had deep and long talks with the general secretary of the Elysee palace, and then I met him personally. We talked for almost 20-25 minutes on those matters which we considered necessary. Earlier, as I always do, I informed the head of state—in this case, Mr. Gorbachev—of my intention to conduct such an exchange of views; and so I simply don't understand how it is possible to appraise the meeting that took place in any other way as polite, normal, and just as it should have been.

And the fact that this question is today put at all boils down to this: that you attach a significance to it which, in essence, it does not have.

[Gorbachev] I would confine my answer to this: that I would use Mr. Mitterrand's last phrase.

[Unidentified female journalist in English] A question from NEWSWEEK magazine, perhaps continuing this theme. Mr. Gorbachev, what kind of relations do you regard as appropriate for the head of a Western state with the head of one of the Soviet republics after the document of the nine republics, which you also signed, on continuing cooperation? How should Western countries approach these republics? What advice would you give to Western leaders?

If you need my advice, I will take the floor. Gentlemen, we should all proceed from the fact that the Soviet Union exists. This is first. Second, that it will continue to exist. Third, that it is a powerful state. And fourth, that it will continue to be such. The difficulties and the crisis patch we are going through is a big test for society. It could not be any less; we must go through it. We arrived at a joint conclusion at my meeting with the republican leaders, initiated by me, that interests of the entire nation must be put above everything else. It is a question about the future of the state, about the future of a single economic space, a market. It is a question about the international role of this state; and all were unanimous in the opinion that we must augment all these parameters and not inflict damage.

In connection with this we talked about having to implement the results of the referendum, and the referendum spoke in favor of the preservation of the Union state as a renewed federation where sovereign republics operate and human rights and freedoms of the individual are provided and guaranteed. This is the key as to how the relations should be restructured. I think that the role of the republics in the new federation in connection with the reform and in connection with the redistribution of powers—I consider this necessary, since until now we have been described as a federation, but in essence we have been a unitary state—their role will change on the basis of decentralizing power and responsibility.

Union bodies will be fornmed of whatever types are needed. They are needed, and they will have everything necessary to implement the main task favored by people at the referendum—to preserve and to impart greater dynamics to this state, this power, and not to diminish its role but on the contrary to increase it. This means that functions will be delegated in the interests of the Union,

in the interests of the states and the republics forming it. The relations and redistribution of responsibility and competence within the country will also be restructured in connection with this, and of course, during the implementation of foreign and foreign economic policy. I think there they will be looked at in such a way that all fundamental issues will be harmonized and foreign policy and foreign economic policy will be worked out in harmonized way; coordination will be ensured during the implementation of this.

This opens up opportunities for the authorities and the governments of the republics to take a more active part in the implementation of foreign policy, foreign economic policy. But at the same time this, and here I have to mention something else: the fact that at the same time we are moving along the road of developing the initiative of the enterprises themselves, the concerns, associations, and so on, and granting them rights, especially where foreign economic activity is concerned. So this is an overall process. I think the journalists who are now working in the Soviet Union are observing this and want to sort it out and are right to want to sort it out. And the politicians want to take up a well-considered position at the stage of perestroyka, perestroyka that in general is fundamental in character.

Taking advantage of my answer to this question I would like to note the fact that there is an understanding of this process on the part of all our partners, our external partners, and we do not feel that interest in us has slackened off. The fact that everyone wants these processes to be over with more quickly and for us to resolve specific problems more actively is another matter. Such questions exist. We even talked about this with the president today, because these processes of perestroyka and reorganization effect making decisions on certain specific issues. But the world is going to be dealing with a mighty power, and at the same time it is going to have an opportunity to associate in new ways, in which our authorities and the representatives of all republics will speak and participate actively.

[Unidentified speaker] The last question, addressed perhaps to the president of France and the president of the Soviet Union. The INTERFAX agency, please.

[Terekhov] Thank you. The INTERFAX agency, Vyacheslav Terekhov. A question for both presidents. Mr. Mitterrand, the position of the Soviet Union at this stage is fairly complex, probably it couldn't be otherwise as far as domestic policy and the economy are concerned. Please tell us to what extent this complexity has influenced your attitude toward the Soviet Union.

And a question for Mikhail Sergeyevich. Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, please tell us, all the events that have taken place over these five or six years, this tempest to right and left—I do not mean political trends to the right and to the left, I mean simply the waves on the right and on the left—please tell us, for you as president, or as we love to compare the president or leader with the commander of a ship, has the helm of state often been knocked out of the hands of state control? And for the last time, the signing—the nine plus one, or the ten—what is this? A continuation of your course? Or is it yet again a necessity you face as president of the Soviet Union to preserve the integrity of the Soviet Union?

It is clear that the president of the Soviet Union is experiencing difficulties, and perhaps the Soviet president himself knows best about this. These difficulties are known throughout the world. It is impossible to conduct a true, profound revolution, as President Gorbachev is doing, without at the same time being subject to many of its consequences, all the more so because, as the opportunity appears to achieve freedom, it becomes very demanding. When there are economic difficulties—and these express themselves in a very harsh way—not to mention local nationalism and if one speaks of the demands with respect to state reorganization, autonomy, and so on, then it is clear that these are not problems which are easily resolved. Very major changes are at issue; out of these flows the need for subsequent, other changes. Naturally, these are not solved by waving a magic wand. I admire the courage of those—especially of the person who has taken upon himself the responsibility for such changes—who remain true to their own conviction.

I would like to count on reckoning on the fact that both in France and in the international arena I shall speak—insofar as I am able—to help the changes, not only of President Gorbachev but of perestroyka. Indeed, why is it necessary for me to change my attitude?

[Gorbachev] On the first part of the question, concerning the tiller, I will agree with you that we are indeed setting a course for our vessel of perestroyka in complex weather and sea conditions. There is a storm, there is no visibility, there is fog; in addition, the instruments are not functioning and not everyone who is needed is in the crew. It is all there. I would, nevertheless, put it like this: The vessel generally is proceeding along the course we have worked out. I call this course the concept of perestroyka. These are the goals connected, designated by this concept. Everything which relates to our subsequent activity within the scope of this course, in order to move on this bearing, is a question of tactics, maneuvering, taking account of the realities, because our path is complex. And all these complexities that I have figuratively listed do exist.

On whether or not the leadership is holding the tiller, I must say the following: Although it sometimes seems to those who are either on board the ship or watching from a distance that the ship is listing in the wrong direction, this is often linked with the fact that many people here are straining to get hold of the tiller and become a hindrance, they pull at one another's arms; this happens sometimes. But in principle, the tiller is being held and the ship will follow the course. This is the first thing.

The signing—was it a continuation of the course or a maneuver? No, comrades, I believe that...[changes thought] Generally speaking I appraise this document very highly, especially it has...it acquires a special importance because of the context in which it was formed and signed. First, it shows that those who signed it have a sense of responsibility for the state and the country's future and for the continuation of this course, and herein lies its importance. I understand that you have come up with these questions here, perhaps, not really in connection with the text of the agreement itself, because all it contains are very serious and necessary things which we need. And I think you would have signed it with us, Comrade Terekhov; I am sure of that. Perhaps you were surprised: Why is some secret memorandum suddenly being mentioned? [Word indistinct] there was no secret memorandum. I do not understand who wants to do this or for what purpose. And, in general, you should ask this question: What could this mean?

Further, our press—which is closer to the Democratic Russia, the Moscow Soviet, and so on—suddenly has started criticizing Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin for having signed this document and is taking the line that he had surrendered his positions, given in, that this is unforgivable, and so on. Perhaps in order to relieve his supporters of this impression, we suddenly heard from Boris Nikolayevich himself and later, it seems, from Khasbulatov and others that no, he had not given in; on the contrary, it was the president who had given in, we had got him on the floor.

You know, generally speaking, that all this is not serious, all this is not serious. When it is a question of a document such as the joint agreement touching upon fundamental issues at such a crucial stage of perestroyka processes, this is not serious. And here the issue emerges once again: What could this mean, Comrade Terekhov? This is something for you and everyone else to go and think about. This means that someone would like this to fail; that although signed, this concord should fail, at least in practice. And if there is a desire, pressure is being brought to bear. First, it proceeded in this way, and then I see that if Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, too, has started speaking in this voice, then powerful pressure is being brought to bear.

And I sent a telegram to the leaders of the republics, where a referendum was conducted, where referenda were conducted, This was put as a basis with a proposal to meet and have a frank talk before flying to Japan. Comrades came, other than those who could not make it; but still there were representatives—the leaders of governments. And this was a very serious, responsible, and principled conversation. It had its own logic and its own development.

Because this was the circle of people who were connected with the referendum, a question arose: A federation? Yes, a federation. A single market? A single market. With attributes and features of a single economic area: money, customs, financial instruments, and so forth. I won't...[changes thought] Taxes? There was an argument about taxes. It will be continued.

On the whole, an exchange was held on all issues. It was a serious and responsible conversation; and I did not see anyone thrown on the floor there, I did not see anyone hit in the pit of the stomach or any other painful spot. No, it was a very responsible conversation and, I must say, a discussion among people who know what is what.

On the basis of this discussion, I announced an interval; and in 45 minutes I dictated these tenets, these points which came to form the basis of this agreement. I presented them. After they were typed up I presented them, and we started to work further on them. Basically, everything was preserved. And yesterday I heard that only 20 percent was left. Is it so? They have started to recalculate it in percentages?

All this is not serious; I do not want to go further. I want to preserve my dedication, and I hope that all participants in this phenomenal and responsible meeting will preserve it at this stage of our country's history and will prove that they can keep their word. If it is maneuvers that are starting in order to deviate from it later, then I think people would not allow these things to be done to them. In a situation when people are awaiting changes for the best, I think it is political death for politicians to put their signatures under such a document to play cheap political games and cheap tricks.

[Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko] Thank you. Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, allow me on your behalf to thank French President Francois Mitterrand and Soviet President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for their participation in our news conference. Thank you very much.

[Gorbachev] Good-bye.

[Kasparov] As you hear, this applause at the main Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs concluded the joint news conference of two presidents—the president of the Soviet Union and the president of France—on the results of the Soviet-French summit talks in Moscow today. But those who were listening to the entire news conference could not fail but notice that it was not so much the question of the meeting itself, but the question of the most important political moments in life. Issues relating to the Near East settlement and to a new thinking in the foreign policy of our country and the world as a whole were touched upon.

Journalists inquired whether the brakes are being applied to the process of democracy that was started in our country six year ago. There were a lot of questions regarding the deepening of interethnic conflicts on Soviet territory. Rather impartial questions were posed to our president, in particular on the essence of his disagreements with Yeltsin and on how he and Yeltsin will hold contacts in the future. There were, however, a lot of questions—a lot of them—on to how to regard the

sovereignty of republics and how to address whom and on how and with whom to hold talks now. All questions were extremely important.

The news conference, which was initially planned for 45 minutes, lasted for more than an hour and a half. I have been present at many news conferences; but this time the entire hall was sitting and journalists remained where they were, crowding and sitting in the aisles, so important were the issues discussed today.

Well, I must say that the French president is leaving our country today; literally in half an hour his plane will take off again. It was a short working visit today; but a short one does not mean an unsuccessful one. Let us hope that the results of this visit will truly reflect the improvement of our bilateral relations as well as the international climate of the world as a whole.

Diplomat Cited on Talks

PM0705211591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by diplomatic correspondent M. Yusin: "Soviet-French Dialogue at Novo-Ogarevo"]

[Excerpts] French President Mitterrand, Foreign Minister Dumas, and their accompanying delegation left Moscow for Paris late Monday evening, having concluded the program of their short working visit. [passage omitted]

According to a Soviet diplomat present at the talks, discussion of European topics presented special interest. The presidents noted that the threat of a split of our continent is being created today in this era of rapid changes accompanied by a growth in tension in Eastern Europe and the emergence of interethnic conflicts. Mitterrand again proposed his concept of a "European confederation" as a measure which could impede this. The Soviet president supported this idea. He also welcomed the holding of an informal conference of European political and public figures in Paris 12-14 June, the inspirers of which are Mitterrand and Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel. Gorbachev stated that Soviet representatives will take part in the conference.

The USSR and French presidents supported the plan for an all-European energy community proposed by the prime minister of the Netherlands.

During discussion of bilateral relations Mitterrand and Gorbachev acknowledged that Soviet-French economic, scientific, and technical ties had yet to reach the desired level.

Great attention was paid to disarmament problems, particularly the Treaty on Reducing Conventional Arms in Euriope, which was signed in Paris last November. France exhibits concern that the USSR is inclined to regard this treaty primarily as a Soviet-American one, ignoring the Europeans to some extent. The French therefore gave great attention to discussing this question. Judging by the responses of embassy staffers, Mitterrand and Dumas are satisfied with the explanations received from the Soviet side.

According to our diplomats, the situation in the Soviet Union was not paid such close attention as was expected in the run up to the meeting. This may possibly explain the "domestic" thrust of the press conference. Assessments of the situation in our country's trouble spots, which Mitterand probably did not hear from Gorbachev during the talks, were expressed at the meeting with journalists.

Latin America & Caribbean

'Constructive' El Salvador Peace Move Welcomed

PM0805110791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "USSR Foreign Ministry Statement"]

[Text] A package of amendments to the Salvadoran constitution, opening the way to a peaceful settlement in that country, was agreed on during the latest round of talks between the Cristiani government and the FMLN [Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front], which has ended in Mexico City. They were approved, albeit with changes, by the Salvadoran Legislative Assembly.

It is proposed, in particular, to place the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the civilian authorities, to remove the police from the control of the military command, to create a special organ designed to monitor human rights observance, and so on.

Having begun peace talks under the auspices of the UN secretary general approximately a year ago, the opposing sides have traveled a difficult path in the search for a political way out of the conflict situation. The decisions adopted do not eliminate all the problems, but they may with good reason be viewed as a result of the sense of responsibility for the country's fate displayed by the government and the rebels and of their understanding of the need to make mutual concessions and sensible compromises.

The world community has made a considerable contribution to the positive progress made in efforts to unblock the crisis situation in El Salvador, and the intermediary activity of J. Perez de Cuellar and his personal representative, which enjoys broad support in the world, has played a particularly important role. The task of assisting the peace process in El Salvador has constantly been in the field of view of Latin American states and at the center of the very productive dialogue

which the USSR and the United States are conducting on questions of a Central American settlement.

While appreciating the progress made, we proceed from the premise that much effort still has to be made in the quest to surmount confrontation and fully normalize the situation in the country on the basis of a balance of interests. The resolution of the remaining political problems and a cease-fire should be counted among the priority tasks facing the sides in this connection.

In welcoming the accords reached, we once again declare our support for the constructive efforts of the Salvadoran Government and the FMLN leadership and express hope that the two sides will continue to do everything possible to get the country onto the path of stable, peaceful development. The Soviet Union is ready to continue giving all possible assistance in achieving this goal and to improve cooperation with the United Nations and with all countries, organizations, and forces with an interest in finally settling the armed conflict in Central America.

Supreme Soviet

Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session

Emergency Session on Armenia Rejected

LD0705184691 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 7 TASS—The Soviet parliament has decided not to hold an emergency congress of Soviet people's deputies to discuss the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan. In a vote today, only eight members of the Soviet parliament supported the proposal, 261 voted against and 23 abstained.

In a resolution following two days of discussions, the Soviet legislature offered the Armenian parliament to revoke its demand to hold an emergency congress.

Parliamentarians said that the conflict has been repeatedly discussed at congresses of Soviet people's deputies and in the national parliament and corresponding decisions were passed, which, however, failed to produce result.

The parliament decided to send a special team from the USSR prosecutor's office and other official bodies on a fact finding mission to the conflict area.

The parliament began the second reading of a bill on immigration. The bill returns the "natural and inalienable right to freedom of travel" to Soviet citizens, Fedor Burlatskiy, member of the parliamentary committee on international affairs, told the legislature.

Half a million citizens would emigrate from the country every year, he predicted. The number of those temporarily leaving the country is forecast at 5-7 million people a year.

Several amendments were made in the bill after the first reading, Burlatskiy said. The bill now sets a one month deadline for considering requests for a foreign passport, lists the grounds on which authorities can deny a person a foreign passport. A person can appeal in court the authorities' refusal to issue a foreign passport.

On May 12 the parliament will continue the debate on the bill, which if passed will go into force on July 1, 1992.

The Supreme Soviet also began discussing amendments to the law on universal military duty. The amendments envisage cutting the term of service for navymen from three to two years.

The parliament endorsed the appointment of Leonid Matyukhin as new railway minister. Matyukhin replaces the resigning Nikolay Konarev.

Victory Day Address Given

PM0705151791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Supreme Soviet address: "On the Occasion of Victory Day in the Great Patriotic War 1941-1945"]

[Text] The Soviet people and their Armed Forces accomplished an unprecedented feat in World War II in making the fundamental contribution to the rout of fascism, as all peoples of good will on the planet recognize.

For 45 years our country has celebrated 9 May—the day of victory in the Great Patriotic War—as a statewide and nationwide holiday, as a day dedicated to the sacred memory of those who died, as an expression of gratitude by their descendants and of respect for the grey and aged servicemen and rear services workers from all nationalities. On this day we honored in grateful memory the wartime fraternity with peoples and servicemen from the other countries in the anti-Hitler coalition. Many pages of our history reflect the glory of this great day.

So it is all the more painful to recognize that in some places, where political passions and ambitions are running high, a desire is emerging to belittle the victory's significance and to consign its celebration to oblivion. The graves of fallen servicemen are being vandalized and desecrated, memorials are being defiled, and places held sacred by the people are being destroyed. Considering such a situation unworthy of a state striving to build a civilized rule-of-law society, the USSR Supreme Soviet addresses soviets at all levels and all the country's citizens: Let us defend Victory Day, the people's historical memory, and let us celebrate 9 May 1991 throughout the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics!

We address Soviet people of all nationalities and all generations: Let us bow our heads in memory of the fallen heroes of the Great Patriotic War and pay homage to the veterans—its participants, to the men and women whose heroic labor ensured victory at the rear and restored the cities and villages destroyed in the war.

On this day we call upon all who have become willing or reluctant participants in interethnic conflicts not to lose sight of the behests of their fathers and grandfathers whose blood, shed in the battlefields of the Great Patriotic War for the freedom of our united multinational motherland, can never be separated. Nor can it be separated in our memory, and it insistently summons us toward peace and accord.

We ask all our compatriots to bow to the courage and heroism of the participants in the unparalleled battles, to lay flowers at their graves, to defend the monuments and memorials, to show concern for the widows of the fallen and for the veterans, and to consign to the earth, as laid down in the tradition of our ancestors, the ashes of those who still lie unidentified in the boundless fields of war.

Addressing the Soviet Army, we ask it on this day to pay military honors to the heroes of the Great Patriotic War throughout the territory of our multinational state.

In this difficult time for our fatherland, let Victory Day become a shining light in the memory of all peoples in the country. Let this day remind us once again that only together, shoulder to shoulder, will we be able to withstand the trials which have fallen to our lot, to withstand and overcome. No one has the right to encroach upon the people's memory, and its purity and inviolability must be defended by our will and our laws. We have one motherland. We have one history. Our sacred duty to all who lived before us and all who will come after us is to save the country from collapse and division, as well as from encroachments from within and without. We all must fight for this and work for this.

Presidents' Joint Statement Considered

PM0705155191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Sitting"]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium sitting took place 6 May in the Kremlin, with A.I. Lukyanov in the chair.

The Presidium focused its attention on the Joint Statement signed by the USSR president and the leaders of nine republics on urgent measures to stabilize the situation in the country and overcome the crisis. It was pointed out at the sitting that the document evoked a tremendous response and won support by many public organizations, trade unions, mass movements, and the broadest strata of our society. Assessing the Joint Statement as an important constructive step toward pooling the efforts by Union and republic leaders to stabilize the political and economic situation in the country, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium outlined practical steps designed to implement the fundamental provisions of this document. Attention was drawn to the need for all subsequent activity on the part of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Union republic supreme soviets to be carried out in close coordination with the statement to ensure that Union and republic laws that are adopted fully accord with the letter and spirit of the accords secured. It was emphasized that the USSR Supreme Soviet and its committees and commissions face the task of vigorously helping to conclude the Union treaty and speed up the formulation of a new draft USSR Constitution.

Deputy Reports on Exit-Entry Law

LD0705232691

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 2002 GMT on 7 May carries a report on a 19-minute recorded presentation of the proposed law on regulations for entering and leaving the USSR given by Deputy Burlatskiy at the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow on 7 May. The new rules set "a time of one month for the issue of a passport for temporary stay abroad." There are to be restrictions on the exit of people with access to state secrets, with "a maximum period of restriction on exit of five years in this case; however, it can be extended by a commission under the USSR Cabinet of Ministers on an individual basis." It is proposed that the law will come into force on 1 July 1992.

At the previous reading of the draft law, the cost of this measure was questioned, with very high figures being cited. A more sober calculation has now been arrived at, based on realistic estimates of those who actually will depart rather than those who say they would like to, in view of the restrictions imposed by host countries. "Last year 454,000 people left the USSR for permanent residence abroad. In 1989 the figure was half that. Five million Soviet citizens went abroad on a temporary basis; in 1989 2.5 million; 85 percent of these went to Eastern European countries. According to estimates by Soviet and Western experts, emigration by Soviet citizens will be about 500,000 per year. The point is, even this year the increase in emigrants is almost nil. As far as temporary departures are concerned, everything will depend on real opportunities. Overall, about 5 to 7 million per year is forecast."

It is estimated that the budget spending required by this law in 1991 to 1995 will be 160 to 240 million rubles and 110 million foreign currency rubles. There will be a considerable inflow from costs paid by travellers. Fears of brain drain have been expressed, but the process has a positive side with the accumulation of experience abroad.

The deputy said: "In the modern world, the populations of 150 states enjoy freedom of travel, including all the countries of Eastern Europe. Can it be that the whole world is out of step and that we are the only ones in step? One can still hear unthinking repetition of stereotypes formed in the past, however. You may recall that one of the deputies here asserted that his electors were opposed to this law. But here are the objective results of an opinion poll published three days ago: 93.6 percent are convinced that such a law should urgently be adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet."

Political & Social

Gorbachev Appoints New Advisers

LD0705135691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1335 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Lyumila Aleksndrova, Aleksandr Kanishchev, and Igor Petrov]

[Text] Moscow, 7 May (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev has appointed a number of well-known Soviet experts as his advisers, Vitaliy Igantenko,

aide to the Soviet head of state and head of his press service, reported at a briefing today. The new advisers are:

Leonid Abalkin, economist and former deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers;

Vladimir Kudryavtsev, legal expert, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who until recently headed the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law;

Yuriy Osipyan, physicist, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences;

Vladlen Martynov, director of the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, and Yuriy Yaremenko, economist, both corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences;

And the writer Boris Oleynik.

Vitaliy Ignatenko noted that all have retained their previous duties and posts.

Gorbachev Meets With Soviet Germans

PM0805130991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "USSR President's Meeting With Representatives of Soviet Germans"]

[Text] The USSR president met in the Kremlin 7 May with representatives of Soviet Germans who are members and activists of the organizing committee to prepare for a congress of USSR Germans. Academician B.V. Raushenbakh, chairman of the organizing committee, and other participants in the meeting said that much has already been done recently to rehabilitate Soviet Germans. However, many complex problems remain on this path.

It was reported with alarm that the 2-million-strong people have no national schools, publication of German-language books has declined, and publication of the sole literary journal has ceased. Emigration has increased, one reason for this being the Soviet Germans' lack of statehood.

The USSR president pointed out that people in our country feel sincere respect for the German people. Their great contribution to the country's development is recognized. The majority of Soviet Germans cannot conceive of themselves outside the USSR and actively advocate the preservation and renewal of the multinational state.

The problems of Soviet Germans were extensively debated at the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The decisions of that and subsequent congresses and USSR Supreme Soviet sessions have created the necessary legal basis for surmounting all the consequences of a dramatic stage in the fate of Soviet Germans.

It was pointed out during the exchange of opinions that the question of the restoration of German statehood in the Volga region is an acute issue on the agenda. But this is only possible under conditions of combining the fundamental interests of all the peoples inhabiting that region. The problem must be resolved in a phased manner, with due regard for the way political and economic conditions shape up. At the same time, where the preconditions for this exist it is necessary to embark right now on the path of creating national rayons and village and settlement soviets in regions densely populated by Soviet Germans. Attention was drawn to the fact that republic state organs and kray and oblast soviets may resolve these questions without waiting for special instructions.

The USSR president supported a proposal to set up a committee for the problems of Soviet Germans under the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, which would operate with a view to implementing a unified state policy toward the Germans of the USSR. At the same time note was taken of the positive work of the state commission and the USSR Supreme Soviet commission which operated under the former Union government.

The president of the Soviet Union reported that a draft decree has been prepared on the restoration of justice in respect of those who worked in the labor army during the Great Patriotic War.

M.S. Gorbachev asked that all Soviet Germans be told that their problems will remain within the field of vision of the Supreme Soviet, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, and the country's president until they have been resolved in full. Confidence was expressed that the republics will also treat this problem with the necessary attention. This is evidenced by the law "On the Rehabilitation of Repressed Peoples" recently adopted by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet.

M.S. Gorbachev wished the organizing committee to prepare for a congress of USSR Germans success in examining the questions submitted for discussion there.

Participating in the meeting were R.N. Nishanov and A.N. Girenko; O.I. Lobov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; Z.L. Fedotova, deputy chairman of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet; K.P. Murenin, chairman of Saratov Oblast Soviet; and A.I. Yegin, deputy chairman of Volgograd Oblast Soviet Executive Committee.

TASS Reviews Soviet Press for 8 May

LD0805071591 Moscow TASS in English 0656 GMT 8 May 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 8 TASS—Newspapers today carry many items dedicated to the Victory Day, which is marked on May 9 in the USSR. When people learn not to

hate each other, this date will perhaps acquire another name, the name that would not underline the precedence of some people over others, and become the day of caution, the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes. Caution against misfortune, discord, mutual hatred, militant national-idiocy, against attempts of one people to wield power over another, and finally, from dictatorship whatsoever. [sentence as received]

PRAVDA carries an official report on Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's Kremlim meeting with representatives of the Soviet Germans—members and activists of the organising committee on preparations for a congress of Germans of the USSR, which took place on Tuesday. The report says that the president backed up the proposal that a committee on Soviet Germans' problems be formed under the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, aimed to further the single state policy towards Soviet Germans.

The press reports that on May 7 Mikhail Gorbachev received Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Vietnam Do Muoi in the Kremlin. The two sides expressed mutual satisfaction with the state of the Soviet-Vietnamese relations which rely on the long-standing traditions of friendship between the peoples of the two countries.

It is also reported that on May 7 the Soviet president received the Ambassador of the United States Jack Matlock. Mikhail Gorbachev asked about President Bush's health. The most vital topics in the Soviet-American dialogue were discussed.

PRAVDA carries a detailed account of Tuesday's joint news conference of Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand, entitled "A Soviet-French Dialogue".

Newspapers continue providing coverage of the work of the USSR parliament, which on Tuesday decided not to convene an extraordinary congress of USSR people's deputies to discuss the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict. It is Armenia's parliament which wants the congress to take place. The Soviet parliament has started the discussion on the second reading of the bill on the USSR entry and leaving procedure.

According to reports on the work of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet, the bill on a state of emergency in the republic was the main item on the agenda on Tuesday. The bill acquires special significance in the context of the precarious social situation in the country, marked with outbursts of interethnic conflicts in different regions of the USSR.

Vyacheslav Shakhov, deputy finance minister of the USSR and chairman of the USSR Gosstrakh board, comments in PRAVDA on the Soviet president's May 6 decree on compensation for the losses from the depreciation of money accumulations of citizens under long-term agreements with the USSR state insurance agencies. The decree, in his opinion, is of great social significance for the population. It reaffirms the great role of the state insurance of citizens' material security.

E. Shcherbanenko writes in PRAVDA about the first independent women's forum in Dubna. The hour has seemingly not struck yet for the emergence of a strong women's movement. It is only the movement of resistance when there is only discontent, with no constructive ideas. [sentence as received]

Georgiy Tarazevich, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's commission for nationalities policy and international relations, writes in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA about the work over the Union treaty. "The results of the work illustrate that agreement can be reached. And, it appears, this is the main thing", the commission chairman believes.

PRAVDA reports that Vietnamese Communist Party leader Nguyn Van Linh is to pay a brief working visit to the Soviet Union in the next few days, in line with a mutual accord.

Joining a crucial political campaign for elections of the Russian Federation's first ever president, the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA has opened a permanent column, entitled "Looking Forward to Presidential Elections in Russia". Vasiliy Kazakov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, today answers questions from a correspondent. He noted a special character of the current campaign—it is brief. The election campaign actually starts from the moment of the registration of candidates, which will take place on May 12-21, with the election date being as near as June 12.

The newspaper RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries a letter from retired mining engineer I. Babokin, who writes about the dire plight of labour protection and safety arrangements. The transition to market relations, the writer of the letter says, will inevitably heighten many labour protection aspects. State and economic organisations will hardly be able to cope with this work. What remains to be done is to draw the public into it.

The Communist Party of Azerbaijan is reemerging from the ashes of the burnt party membership cards. Rafael Guseinov, writing in RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, gives an explanation for the fact that less than in a year, the demoralised party, which was under constant fire from the opposition and which lost much prestige in the eyes of the people, was able to raise on its feet again and confidently win the free elections, taking most of the seats in the republican parliament.

Renunciation of perestroyka would imply a catastrophe. This is the opinion of Arkadiy Volskiy, president of the scientific-industrial union. TRUD carries the text of a talk with him.

Kakimbek Salykov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's committee for ecology, writing in TRUD, dwells on the substance and the specific features of the USSR Supreme Soviet's law "on social security of citizens, who suffered from the Chernobyl accident".

The newspaper TRUD under the headline "Yoke" carries an item from the newspaper "MOLODOI DALNEVOSTOCHNIK" on the joint Soviet-South Korean lumbering and wood working venture, and its significance for the maritime territory.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA prints a summary of the decree, signed by Boris Yeltsin, "on stronger control and practical assistance from the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet in carrying out the land reform".

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries a detailed story about Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov's recent five day official visit to the People's Republic of China.

Vsevolod Ovchinnikov, deputy chairman of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, writes in PRAVDA about the Sino-Soviet relations and their future. In his dispatch from Beijing he notes that the firm opinion in China's capital is that the Chinese Communist Party leader's Moscow visit will lend a fresh impetus to Sino-Soviet cooperation and interaction.

Alksnis Criticizes 'Concessions' to West

LD0605201391 Berlin ADN in German 1836 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—USSR foreign policy has forgotten the lessons of the war and made one-sided concessions to the West. Viktor Alksnis, USSR Supreme Soviet member, made this statement in an interview with the daily newspaper JUNGE WELT (Tuesday's edition). Much in the Soviet Union is happening according to a Western scenario. "The West is really interfering in our development," said Alksnis, one of the leaders of the "Soyuz" legislative deputies group which is considered conservative. He sees in developments in Germany as confirmation of his ideas.

Alksnis demands a "regulated market with a mechanism for social protection". In order to allow for this restructuring of the economy, he said, a strong force is necessary. According to the "Soyuz" representative this can be the Soviet Army because it has preserved its unity and centralization.

Yakovlev Interviewed on Future of Perestroyka

OW0805101491 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1900 GMT 14 Apr 91

[Report on interview with Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev by correspondent S. Iyezuitov in Paris; from the "Utro 120 + 30" program]

[Text] Our next report is from France. "What Do We Want To Make of the Soviet Union?" is the intriguing title of the new book by Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, leader of the group of advisors to the USSR president. It is true that so far this book has been published only in France, but we hope that in time we too will be able to find out what the presidential advisors want to make of the present-day Soviet Union.

[Iyezuitov] Journalists have arrived at this building, where one of the most beautiful business centers of Paris is located, to hear what is going on in our country from the man who is called the Ideologist of Perestroyka.

His book, written together with well-known Sovietologist Lilly Marcou, talks about our country and the things that deeply worry all the people. Will our state be governed by laws and become democratic, or can we expect a return to the dark times of dictatorship? [video shows camera crew and reporters interviewing Yakovlev]

[Begin Yakovlev recording] A certain danger exists because the conservative forces have become extremely active, and in a generalized way they can be called a revanchist party. At the same time, I do not believe in the possibility of a military dictatorship, or in the possibility of a sharp recoil because it is impossible to turn history around and repeat it, irrespective of who tries to do it. [end recording]

[Iyezuitov] As you can see this disturbs not only us, but everyone else as well. People understand perfectly well that to a great extent they will depend on the direction taken by the development of events in the USSR. They sympathize with us, try to help as much as they can, and ask the same question that you and I do—What about perestroyka? Is it over? [video cuts back to Yakovlev]

[Begin Yakovlev recording] The decisive stage of perestroyka has come. I consider the rest to have been a singular preparation. The preparation of conditions to solve the two most important problems of perestroyka are the creation of a new state system and the creation of a new model for the economy. [end recording]

KGB Secrets 'Revealed' at Meeting

PM0805103391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Yu. Shabanov report under the rubric "PRAVDA Festival—May Day for Party and People": "KGB Without Mysteries or Secrets"]

[Text] The conference hall of the Trade Unions Exhibition and Methodological Center was filled long before the start of the debate: The conversation promised to be extremely interesting. Currently many "revealing" articles on the KGB are appearing in the press—many of them are, as a rule, far from the truth, or else they simply contain disinformation whose aim is to sling mud at the Chekists and portray the KGB as a monster guarding the administrative edict system.

But what do the staff of the country's most secret organization think about their work? Incidentally, a considerable number of secrets have already been revealed here. Within reasonable limits, you understand, to ensure that the country's security does not suffer. And

yesterday's meeting entitled "KGB Without Secrets" likewise took place under the banner of lifting the veil of secrecy from the Chekists' work.

Lieutenant General V. Kirpichenko, first deputy chief of the USSR KGB Foreign Intelligence Directorate, talked about the difficult duties of Soviet intelligence officers and their professional competence and courage. Colonel A. Grinenko, a leading staffer of the USSR KGB Counterintelligence Directorate, spoke about the way our counterintelligence had succeeded in foiling Western special services' secret schemes to destabilize the situation in our country. In the last few years alone around 30 recruited agents have been exposed. "Is that a lot or not many?" the audience asked. "You can find that out from the Western special services," Grinenko replied. He also cited other figures: In the last few years the Chekists have returned 220 million rubles [R] to the state from their fight against organized crime.

One of the counterintelligence subunits for suppressing contraband is doing a great amount of work. Not only antiques, church paraphernalia, and icons but also raw materials and semifinished products are currently being stolen from the fatherland. Last year they managed to stop the export of over 3 million tonnes of metals and metal products. A group of international criminals which was trying to export 20 kg of gold worth R1.5 million from the country was exposed.

Those present listened attentively to Colonel Yu. Say, deputy chief of a department in the USSR KGB Directorate for Protecting the Soviet Constitutional System, who recounted how Western subversion centers operate on our country's territory, and to Soviet intelligence veteran Colonel (Retired) A. Baydakov, who publicized unknown pages from the Chekists' activities on the eve of World War II.

Also speaking at the meeting were Major General G. Martynov, deputy chief of the USSR KGB Border Guard Troops Military Political Directorate; Colonel A. Dukhanin, chief of a department in the USSR KGB Investigation Directorate; Colonel B. Yampolskiy, senior scientific staffer at the F.E. Dzerzhinskiy USSR KGB Higher School; Major General V. Yarlychenko, chief editor of the magazine POGRANICHNIK; and writer I. Shevtsov, chief of a wartime border troops subunit. The audience asked a considerable number of questions, and the Chekists answered them in detail.

The meeting was conducted by Major General A. Karbainov, chief of the USSR KGB Public Relations Center, and G. Ovcharenko, deputy editor of PRAVDA's social policy department.

KGB Special Service 70th Anniversary Marked

PM0705090791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by G. Semenov: "Special Service Jubilee"]

[Text] A ceremony devoted to the 70th anniversary of the USSR KGB Special Service took place in the F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Central Club yesterday. On 5 May 1921 V.I. Lenin signed a resolution forming a special department under the All-Russian Special Commission for Combatting Counterrevolution, Sabotage, and Speculation [Cheka], which laid the foundation for the activities of the KGB Special Service, of which the Soviet public knew practically nothing until recently.

The name "special" was used because of the service's special importance and secret functions. Its activities are geared primarily to the reliable protection of coded government, diplomatic, military, and other types of communications used by the country. The service also handles electronic reconnaissance, which provides the organs of state power with the information they need for the normal functioning of our country's foreign policy, economic, and other activities.

A. Denisov, deputy chairman of the USSR KGB, delivered a report on the 70th anniversary of the Special Service. He said that the service had traversed a great and glorious path. Collaborating closely with other components of the Cheka-KGB and with many academic and industrial organizations, it has always made an appreciable contribution to safeguarding the country's security. During the Great Patriotic War its staff carried out dedicated work at the front and at home and reliably protected the country's coded communications against foreign intelligence beyond the front line and in foreign countries. The decoding services of Germany, Japan, and other states were unable to crack our codes in order to obtain information about our military command's plans. At the same time, our country's leadership promptly obtained information on a number of fascist Germany's and militarist Japan's most important plans.

The conversion now under way in the country has also affected the Special Service, which has a large scientific and technical potential, primarily in the sphere of mathematics, communications, electronics, and computers. Its staff now intend to make more efficient use of their potential for solving applied tasks, in particular for the protection of commercial communications and the establishment of integrated networks of closed communications in the interests of a wide range of users.

Stankevich Warns About KGB, Army

AU0705080291 Vienna Domestic Service in German 0500 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] Moscow Vice Mayor Sergey Stankevich said during an official visit to Vienna that the Army and the KGB are still instruments of terror in the Soviet Union. He hopes that the political alliance between Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin is not just a tactical strategy. Stankevich also hopes that following presidential elections in Russia, the reforms will be carried out without delay.

Frolov Defends Perestroyka, PRAVDA's Role

PM0705154791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 May 91 Second Edition p 5

["Meetings, Discussions" report by T. Panina, member of the International Women's Press Club "Thirty-Three Plus One" and observer of the PRAVDA Humanitarian Problems Department: "'Thirty-Three Plus One' at PRAVDA"]

[Excerpts] The PRAVDA editorial collegium conference room looked somewhat unusual on the day in question. The places of the editorial collegium members, mostly men by the way, were occupied by women journalists from the international women's press club. I.T. Frolov, chief editor of PRAVDA and the only man at the meeting, found himself in what was an unusual role for him. This "disposition of forces" is due to the form of the club's work and its very title—"Thirty-Three Plus One."

Thirty-three—that is how many women journalists, both foreigners accredited in Moscow and Soviet women working for various newspapers and magazines as well as on television and radio, belong to this club which, in its three years of existence, has become known not only in our country but abroad, too. And the "plus one" refers to the man who is elected for the routine discussion and the collective interview. [passage omitted]

The latest meeting, attended by Academician I.T. Frolov, chief editor of PRAVDA and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, provided an opportunity for first-hand information on the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum and the processes now occurring in and around it.

The main idea in I.T. Frolov's answers and thoughts on this topic was that in conditions of the confrontation and demarcation of political forces the Communist Party can strengthen its positions only if it unswervingly promotes the further development of the democratic process, which is the essence of perestroyka. He expressed total disagreement with the view that it will regain its former power if it reverts to those forms of activity which were used before the perestroyka era, and described this as a dangerous position capable merely of isolating the Communists.

Talking about critics of perestroyka within the party and criticism that Gorbachev is indecisive, I.T. Frolov remarked: What certain forces in the party see as decisiveness and principle often leads directly to confrontation and intensied opposition within society, which really could develop into civil war.

There are things to criticize perestroyka for, but it is only in Stalin's "Short Course" that the party and its appointed leaders were absolutely right in everything and irreproachable. That is not how it happens in real life and politics. Moreover Gorbachev is sometimes accused of things which, to put it mildly, do not correspond to the facts. Can we regard as serious and constructive the attempts to revive the myth that socialist values were steadfastly accumulated before 1985 and then "betrayed" during perestroyka?

"What is happening now," our interlocutor said, "is reminiscent of the situation in the mid-sixties. There is that same nostalgia for authoritarianism and for procedures violently imposed on millions of people. However, a return to the old ways cannot be allowed, because that will be disastrous for society."

On the new CPSU Program, as leader of the creative group preparing the draft, I.T. Frolov said that it contains a modern understanding of the party's role and place taking into account present political realities and the global processes occurring in the world. The main things here are people's problems and humanity, which inspire optimism and divert us from, among other things, rigid ideological principles, destroying the old stereotypes and directing public thought toward a philosophical understanding of what is going on. Essentially this means a switch from one way of thinking to another. To humanist thinking. This is also contained in the draft new Program. We should not get bogged down in terminology, I.T. Frolov added. We can talk about a future humane democratic society: One person may call that socialism, another may call it something else. The main thing is the essence reflected in real life. I think that a partywide discussion on the CPSU Program that is being prepared is extremely important precisely for a consideration of Communists' new ideas and positions in today's conditions.

Ivan Timofeyevich was asked many questions on the content of PRAVDA, there were some criticisms of tendentiousness, sometimes even a "toothlessness." To which he answered that as chief editor he is striving to ensure that PRAVDA is viewed as a newspaper and not, as before, as an organ which tries to instruct everyone and which claims to be perfect and faultless. PRAVDA is a newspaper and thus can make mistakes and should recognize its mistakes, including mistakes in matters of information. However, it must not sink, as often happens in some publications, to the level of petty intrigues or muck-raking which is passed off as boldness and as having "teeth".

A democratic community is being formed in our country, I.T. Frolov said, and that includes the press and journalism, where our strength will lie in the fact that we are not similar and that each one has the right to his own vision of what is happening. It is just that it would be good if this were not short-term and of course if all baseness and low, unworthy standards of discussion were excluded.

At the end of the meeting, which lasted almost three hours, Soviet and foreign journalists asked a question which has unfortunately become traditional: Why are there virtually no women in the editorial collegiums of

many mass media, including PRAVDA, the senior newspaper? We Soviet women journalists cannot boast the kind of wide representation that our counterparts have abroad, where they are undoubtedly shown greater confidence.

This reproach was accepted by the PRAVDA chief editor (this is due to the same old stereotypes, he agreed), and we received assurances that he will try to change the situation on this matter, at least in his own editorial office.

PRAVDA Editorial Views CPSU Plenum

PM0705145091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 91 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Editorial: " 'To Help the Country Gather Its Forces'—That Is the Duty of the Communists' Party Today: On the Results of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission Joint Plenum"]

[Text] The political calendar this spring is packed with events that affect every one of us to some extent. Undoubtedly one of the most notable was the April CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission Joint Plenum. And however much some people may wish to assure us that the plans and concerns of Communists are now their own purely internal affair, in fact millions of people, the whole of our society, followed the plenum's work with unfeigned interest. The foreign mass media, as in the past, gave priority attention to the plenum. Its outcome—tough talking, marked by acute, dramatic shifts, devoted to the situation in the country and in our party—is even now prompting heated debates.

True, party forums nowadays do not adopt all-embracing directives that are binding for universal implementation. They are more of a collective consultation process, a choice, a clarification of our positions on the most urgent current problems. And how can anyone be indifferent to the attitude toward these vital problems expressed by the party of Communists, in whose ranks there are more than 1 million people? The party whose representatives make up a majority of the union organs of power, the party that the USSR president heads.

We are all worried about the situation in the country: It has reached a critical point, and is now becoming even more acute. How can we extricate the economy from the crisis and halt a development of events that is dangerous to the future of the people, the country, the state? There is nowadays no shortage of emotional assessments, each more alarming than the last, of the grave, potentially catastrophic situation. These assessments contain much that is just. But we cannot now confine ourselves purely to baldly stating the facts, we cannot delay or frivolously confine ourselves to looking for culprits. Invocations will not prevent disaster. What is to be done?—that is the main question now. And people have a right to demand an answer to it from the biggest, most influential party, and first and foremost from its top elected bodies.

And that is what was expected of the plenum; that was the chief cause of the interest in its work.

But this time the range of expectations was, you could say, very broad and diverse. It reflected both the tense social atmosphere and profound contradictions that are tearing the country apart today, and the fierce struggle among various forces and currents both in society and within the CPSU. Before the plenum there were a great many rumors and predictions about the demands from various quarters for the general secretary of the party Central Committee to give an account of himself and about M.S. Gorbachev's possible resignation from that post. Many people were just waiting for a sensation. Some of them—people who are openly opposed to the CPSU—were acting on the principle "the worse things get, the better," nurturing hopes of weakening our party and its influence among the people and finally removing it from the political arena. Others, thrown into confusion by the difficulties the country is experiencing, took the opportunity to try to make the party and its Central Committee renounce the radical democratic transformations of all spheres of society's life.

"Attempts are now being made not only verbally, but in practice," M.S. Gorbachev said bluntly when he opened the plenum, "to divert the country from the path of reform, either by plunging it into another ultrarevolutionist adventure that could destroy our statehood, or by taking it back to the past, to a dressed-up totalitarian regime. I hardly need to explain that I am talking about the plans of the left and right radicals. Both these currents are pernicious. And the biggest danger today is that they have now come together, despite their apparently implacable mutual hostility."

It is not surprising that all this had some effect on the atmosphere at the plenum and on the emotional and sometimes strained polemics that developed over the anticrisis program. And it must be admitted that by no means all the participants were able immediately to embark on a businesslike, constructive discussion or adopt the right stance. To grasp the fact that today there are no simple or painless formulas—each step demands that Communists show courage, political will, thoughtfulness, and resolution.

Setting aside the details and the heat of passions, two different approaches clearly emerged to the question of how, by what methods, the country's extrication from the crisis can and should be ensured. And that means the choice of the main avenues of CPSU activity and areas of application of all the party organizations' efforts.

To seek constructive solutions through the continuation and development of reforms designed to radically renew our society and modernize it—that is the crux of the first approach. It arises from the logic of perestroyka and the course of democracy. The other approach, which emerged clearly on the eve of the plenum and attracted a good many supporters by virtue of its dangerous simplicity, is to impose a countrywide state of emergency,

strict discipline, and order. Of course the country is tired of chaos, rally fever, strikes, and ultimatums. But even in that atmosphere is it really possible to embark on the path of returning to the obsolete political system of the preperestroyka period? Need it be said that this "alternative" to perestroyka is unacceptable and will not meet with understanding or support from the majority of people, even those who today take a critical view of the events of the last six years?! After all, it would mean renouncing all the democratic gains since April 1985 and taking the country back—to the authoritarian bureaucratic system, to totalitarianism, to the suppression of rights and freedoms, to everything that distorted socialism and led inevitably to a disastrous laggardness in relation to modern world civilization.

The course of the discussions also bore the imprint of the resolutions and statements adopted by a number of party committees prior to the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission Plenum rejecting the USSR Cabinet of Ministers anticrisis program out of hand, so to speak. Even the "headquarters" of certain leading party organizations hurried to give a sharply critical assessment of this program—often without a detailed, in-depth discussion, sometimes "by hearsay."

Any program, however ideal, will produce nothing unless it is backed up by purposeful practical work by the party and its organizational and ideological structures. It is not, of course, a question of going back to the superseded practice of unthinking "nods of approval" for directives sent down from above. The discussion at the plenum showed that the USSR Government's anticrisis program has many vulnerable points and requires substantial further work. The speakers' concern is understandable: Could the planned measures lead to an intensification of the division of society into rich and poor, to mass unemployment, will the main burden of overcoming the crisis fall on the working people's shoulders? Especially since there have already been bad examples of hasty actions whose political and social consequences were not fully thought out. For instance, the recent sharp increase in prices, not being backed up by full compensation, led to mass dissatisfaction and increased the tension in a number of republics. Would it not have been possible to foresee this reaction by the population and prevent explosions of indignation through timely social protection measures? And it has become customary to blame the center alone for this, although the local organs of power, like the party committees, had both the time and the opportunity to consider and undertake such measures.

Clearly, any infringement of people's interests is also a blow against the party and the rank-and-file Communists, who in this situation find themselves blamed for what is not their fault, taking the flak for unpopular decisions. The participants in the debate spoke of this with concern from the plenum rostrum.

The plenum assessed the joint statement by the USSR president and the leaders of nine republics highly, as a good basis for a breakthrough in the development of the situation in the country, and called for everything possible to be done to promote the implementation of the agreed strategy. It supported the USSR Government's efforts to extricate the economy from the crisis. At the same time it was deemed necessary to strengthen many sections of the anticrisis program and give more thought to the mechanism for its implementation. And the most important thing is to take fuller account of the working people's interests and do everything possible to halt the decline in the population's living standard and provide them with social protection. The problems of employment, the provision of housing, and the normalization of the consumer market must be tackled more persistently.

"The plenum insists," the resolution "On the Situation in the Country and Ways of Extricating the Economy From the Crisis" notes, "that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, in conjunction with the republics' governments, urgently analyze the results of the price reform that has begun and make the adjustments dictated by the situation." It is first and foremost a question of additional measures to compensate for the increased cost of meals for students and schoolchildren and reduce the price of goods for children, and also the new tariffs for railroad and air transportation. The plenum came out in favor of lifting the 5-percent sales tax on socially significant goods and introducing index-linking of the population's income.

Among the demands that should be taken into account in the course of finalizing the anticrisis program are the creation of effective material incentives for labor collectives and the emancipation of commodity producers. Along with the strengthening of labor discipline, these are the most important factors for overcoming the recession in production and increasing the volume of output. "The transition to market relations," the resolution stresses, "should be strictly regulated, to preclude the development of profound property demarcations in society and the elimination of the working people's social gains. There must be a thorough preliminary political, economic, and legal study of questions of price deregulation, the dismantling of state ownership and privatization, and the attraction of foreign capital into the country."

It is not hard to imagine that these decisions—which are not particularly radical by today's standards—will lead (and are already leading) to further accusations that the Communists are overcautious, or even incapable of drastic changes. Especially from those forces that pin their hopes on the enterprise of life's new masters and a rapid, spontaneous surge forward to the market, and call for "free" privatization and the total dismantling of state ownership come what may. But it should be clear to any unbiased person that you cannot shift the burden of overcoming the crisis onto the working people's shoulders, bypassing labor collectives and trade union organizations in resolving these questions. And so the plenum participants said.

The plenum came out in favor of the immediate implementation of emergency anticrisis measures with a view to restoring and strengthening the country's integrated state banking system and establishing strict state monitoring of foreign economic activity. Here delay is really intolerable, and carries the risk of irrecoverable losses. The same is true of the struggle against the shadow economy and its tendency to merge with the state and economic apparatus.

The plenum resolution defines the most important areas of application of the party organizations' efforts in tackling a whole range of urgent tasks for extricating the country from the crisis. To express these in a single brief formula, they amount to a call to help the country gather its forces at a difficult time. The CPSU addresses this appeal to other political forces and movements too. It is prepared to act, to use all its influence and authority, all the party's potential, in order to speed up the processes of extricating the country from the crisis, uniting to this end all society's patriotic forces, all democratic political movements which are committed not in word, but in deed to the people's well-being and the restoration and strengthening of constitutional order in our society.

It is impossible to extricate the country from the crisis without overcoming intolerance, the extremes of the political struggle, and the temptation to take emotional decisions. It is important to prevent regression, the destruction of legitimate state structures, and the formation of an explosive power vacuum. Otherwise the country is threatened by the danger of a cruel battle among opposing political forces that seek a monopolist domination of the state and society. Democratic institutions could be replaced by yet another kind of tyranny, a real dictatorship, rather than the imaginary one that some people, without foundation, detect in the present constitutional regime. A historic opportunity to modernize the country through reforms, by peaceful means, will be lost.

A special resolution was adopted on the Communists' work in the soviets of people's deputies, which in today's conditions have become an arena of acute political struggle. The stepping up of attention toward the organs of people's power and the strengthening of links and collaboration with them is acquiring particular importance for our party. And this should not be a brief campaign with the aim of consolidating our positions. These are fundamental, long-term avenues of CPSU policy.

At the same time the party reflected the complex, highly contradictory and alarming processes taking place within the party itself.

"There is among Communists," the plenum resolution notes, "a growing dissatisfaction with the situation in the CPSU, and justified demands are being voiced that the party's leading organs act more resolutely and with the participation of party organizations to define ways and means of implementing the 28th CPSU Congress political course and draw up effective measures to overcome the crisis in the economy."

Critical arrows were also fired from the plenum rostrum. The tone was set for the discussion by certain leaders of party committees, among them a number of members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. Well, everyone has the right to criticize. But it is characteristic that whereas there was more criticism than ever before of the Union Government and the general secretary of the party Central Committee—and sharp, merciless criticism at that—there was a total lack, in some of the speeches, of self-critical analysis of one's own actions. As if anyone but the leaders of party committees could be held directly responsible for the failures locally. For the fact that, for instance, the party organizations in the coal fields were basically swept away by the strike wave and found themselves incapable of not only influencing, but even making contact with the workers' movement.

And how, for instance, can you explain the fact that many primary party organizations have withdrawn from influencing the economy and lost trust and prestige among the labor collectives—where it is most needed now? Surely it was not because of a lack of directives from the center?

It must be openly admitted—and this emerged very clearly during the preparations for the plenum and during its work—that the CPSU is heterogeneous, not only in its composition, but also in the Communists' views and ideas on the paths of future development.

Of course, in an overheated social atmosphere, when dire problems surround us on all sides, it is not easy to stand firm, unwavering, and hold on to your sense of direction. Remaining true to our socialist choice and overcoming difficulties and doubts, to advance along the path of radical transformations of all aspects of society's life. But there is, as the saying goes, no alternative.

The party is part of society, and it should change with society and keep pace with its demands in interpreting the complex processes of life and reality. Unfortunately, not infrequently it is slow to conduct this analysis and loses the political initiative, and that means losing prestige in the eyes of many people, who are constantly urged, by the CPSU's opponents, to believe that our party is incapable of constructive actions and democratic renewal. Worse, the party organizations themselves sometimes foster such doubts, being slow to restructure their work in the new conditions. Demands were put forward, for instance, for the convocation of an extraordinary CPSU congress, although the decisions of the 28th congress have only just begun to be really put into practice—in fact, some people have apparently already forgotten them. As they have forgotten that the party has a political line formulated collectively and on a truly democratic basis, and that they must be guided by it and proceed accordingly.

Indisputably the most dramatic moment in the work of the party forum was the moment when, in the course of the debate, in connection with particular speeches by the plenum participants, M.S. Gorbachev raised the question of his resignation from the post of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. This statement was by no means merely an emotional reaction to sharp and sometimes insulting criticism of the leader of perestroyka, as it might appear at first sight. The point at issue was the attitude toward the course set in April 1985, the approach to the resolution of urgent problems of overcoming the crisis, and the choice of guidelines for the future. To abandon democratic reforms and aspirations, to abandon the cardinal transformations begun on the initiative of the CPSU and its leadership in the economic, political, and spiritual spheres, would be disastrous for the party and would push it onto the sidelines of political life.

The risks inherent in this approach should be clear to everyone. Basically it would be the start of counterperestroyka. But it did not happen!

The plenum eventually, after a heated debate, came out against attempts to draw the party into a new wave of contention within the party, which could distract it, at such a tense time, from the main problems of the country's life and prevent it from concentrating all its efforts on practical work to overcome the crisis. Democratic and progressive forces in the party and on its "main staff" were able to consolidate their positions and uphold the course of perestroyka. They have sufficient influence and prestige in the party and country and certainly will and should play a more active part. And that inspires optimism.

By an overwhelming majority of votes, the Central Committee members supported the CPSU Central Committee Politburo proposal and adopted a decision to remove from consideration the question of the Central Committee general secretary's resignation, in the higher interests of the country, the people, and the party. Only 13 people voted against, with 14 abstentions.

The danger of a split in the party and its departure from the 28th CPSU Congress line—and that is how matters could have developed—was averted. Political realism prevailed, the awareness that given the most difficult circumstances it is irresponsible to put group, short-term interests and prejudices first, to elevate only one's own view of the problems to a position of paramount importance, and thereby to weaken the party and its positions in an exceptionally complex situation. The quest for answers to problems relevant to the party can and must be conducted in such a way that it does not lead to confrontation, but, on the contrary, promotes a constructive atmosphere both in the Central Committee and in the party as a whole and helps to establish the principles of party comradeship.

It is vitally important for the party that these sentiments determine the atmosphere today in all the party committees and all party organizations. That well-thought-out, constructive conclusions be drawn from the tough talking that took place at the plenum—primarily by members of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission and leaders of republic and other local CPSU party committees. This is every Communist's cause. The plenum noted the need more actively to involve all party members in the formulation of key decisions and proposals, to establish the power of the party masses in practice, and to enhance the Communists' level of political sophistication.

There was perhaps a particularly acute discussion at the plenum of shortcomings in the party's theoretical work and the importance of an in-depth interpretation of the past, objective analysis of the problems and lessons of the present, and precise, scientifically substantiated predictions for the future. A substantial boost will undoubtedly be given to this work by the drafting of the new CPSU Program, which is called upon to summarize and creatively master new ideas and approaches, the experience of perestroyka, and its contradictions and to take into account the present-day realities of life and the trends in social development in our country and the world. The first draft has already been drawn up and distributed to members of the Program Commission by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary. There are alternative drafts too. These questions are under discussion in the pages of party publications. It has been deemed necessary to accelerate work on the draft Program and organize matters in such a way as to ensure that as many Communists as possible take part in drawing it up and that it becomes a real and lasting basis for the party's strategy and policy, its real renewal, and the strengthening of its prestige in society. Remember that the 28th CPSU Congress instructed the Program Commission to publish the draft new CPSU Program for discussion within the party in the first half of 1991.

V.I. Lenin, in his day, called on the party not to be afraid to do work on itself, and warned against complacency. The results of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission April Plenum show that efforts in this direction should be redoubled and trebled. Only thus can our party restructure its ranks, gain the people's confidence, and avoid being deflected from the chosen course of cardinal renewal of society along the path of democratic reforms.

CPSU Control Commission Plenum Report

PM2904132791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 91 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "CPSU Central Control Commission Plenum"]

[Text] A CPSU Central Control Commission plenum was held 23 April 1991 to examine organizational questions.

The plenum met B.K. Pugo's request and released him from his duties as chairman and member of the CPSU Central Control Commission Presidium in connection with his confirmation as USSR minister of internal affairs and in accordance with his application.

The plenum confirmed Ye.N. Makhov as acting chairman of the CPSU Central Control Commission, releasing his from his duties as first deputy chairman of the CPSU Central Control Commission.

The plenum elected as members of the CPSU Central Control Commission Presidium A.I. Griyenko, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops Political Directorate, and N.N. Korablev, chairman of the Leningrad Oblast CPSU Organization Control and Auditing Commission.

The plenum heard a report from Ye.N. Makhov on the participation of CPSU Central Control Commission members in the commission's work. Its participants exchanged opinions on the tasks of control organs in the contemporary situation and made suggestions aimed at stepping up the CPSU Central Control Commission's work in specific areas of its activity. Chairmen of the control (auditing) commissions of union republic communist parties participated in the plenum's work.

Leaders' Agreement Surprises Kuzbass

914F0205A Moscow TRUD in Russian 30 Apr 91 p 1

[Article by TRUD correspondent Yu. Kotlyarov: "Strike Committee at the Crossroads"]

[Text] Kemerovo—**It is now obvious that the joint declaration of the leaders of nine republics and the president of the country, which is signed by B.N. Yeltsin as well, "On Immediate Measures for Stabilizing the Situation in the Country and Overcoming the Crisis," caught the Kuzbass miners' strike committees unawares.**

It is confusing: How can this be, since the present strike with its purely political demands began with the approval of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia, of which we were assured openly in rallies and meetings, as well as in the press by certain people's deputies of the republic and the oblast (and nobody denied these assertions). And suddenly—"leaders of the Union and republics are appealing to miners and all workers to halt the strikes because of economic and political factors and to strive to make up for what has been lost in the near future" and at the same time they "consider intolerable attempts to achieve political ends through inciting civil disobedience."

Literally on the eve of the publication of this document, the oblast strike committee sent to the Supreme Soviets of the country and republic telegrams demanding that they immediately consider the strikers' political slogans with a view to satisfying their demands (that is, the retirement of the president, the parliament and the USSR Congress of People's Deputies). Were their efforts in vain?

Clearly in a rebellious mood, the strike committee sent a telegram to B. Yeltsin: Explain how we are to understand this document which you signed. The strike committee leaders did not want to comment on their position. In Novokuznetsk they held an open meeting, from which they excluded representatives of the press. During the night between Friday and Saturday there was a telephone conversation between the chairman of the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, A. Tuleyev, and B. Yeltsin. The result: In the evening the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet came to Novokuznetsk to meet with the miners. As soon as his plane arrived he had a conversation with members of the strike committee. We will have more to say about that. The preliminary itinerary for B. Yeltsin's present trip includes a visit to the mines and participation in the May Day rallies.

For now, each day of the strike is causing ever greater losses, including to the miners themselves, who are more and more inclined toward the idea of resuming work after the holiday, regardless of the results of the negotiations with B. Yeltsin. Yesterday the main jobs were not performed at 36 of the mines (last Friday—40). The indebtedness to the consumers for coal exceeds 4.5 million tons since the beginning of April.

Sobchak Interviewed on Political Scene

PM2404135091 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 13, 31 Mar-7 Apr 91 pp 6-7

[Undated Leningrad interview with Anatoliy Sobchak, Chairman of Leningrad City Soviet, by Andrey Chernov: "Anatoliy Sobchak: 'The Country Won't Have Another Civil War'"]

[Text] [Chernov] It looks as if the word "extraordinary" has come to stay. Now we are in for an extraordinary Congress of Russia's People's Deputies. But you are not going to speak at this congress because you are a USSR people's deputy, is that right?

[Sobchak] No, it's not right. I hope I will be given the floor, since I have something to say about Russia's unity, from the rostrum of an all-Russia Congress. We were to sign a draft Treaty of the Russian Federation at the meeting of the Council of the Russian Federation on March 20. This draft is fairly good and well thought over. It was adopted in the main a month ago. However, a seemingly small detail turned into a major predicament: which of the subjects to the Russian Federation will sign the Unity Treaty and how? It is clear that it is the prerogative of Russia and Republics incorporated into Russia, as well as other ethnic-territorial entities represented in Russia's delegation.

[Chernov] Even a month ago nobody contested this point.

[Sobchak] That's true. But a month is a long time; long enough to put through several plans. So the forces interested in destabilizing Russia began to whisper in the ear of leaders eager to listen, saying that subjects of the federation must have the right to sign the Union Treaty independently.

[Chernov] But this would amount to absurdity. This would deny the fact of Russia's existence.

[Sobchak] Precisely. From the point of view of state law and common law and from the political point of view, too, the subject of one state does not have the right to sign the documents of another state. In fact, this is the beginning of the decomposition of Russia, though it has never been admitted openly.

[Chernov] Can you identify these evil forces?

[Sobchak] I think the scenario originates from a certain office in Moscow's Staraya Square. It was devised by those who protest the loudest against the decomposition of the USSR. I mean primarily the leaders of the Communist Party of Russia. They are trying to make Russia fall apart to retain their own monopoly rule over the country.

[Chernov] Does that mean that the classic principle "divide and rule" is being applied today in order to weaken Russia and Yeltsin?

[Sobchak] You are right. I'm astounded at the lack of foresight on the part of those now implementing this principle. The central authorities would have a political niche for themselves in a union of sovereign republics, but the disintegration of Russia would spell chaos for the state and civil war for the country. At the Council of the Russian Federation representatives of certain territories and regions suggested that it would perhaps be appropriate to think about the possibility of creating a Russian Republic. Thank God, there's been no bloodshed in Russia so far. To the credit of Russia's current leadership who have always managed to find a way to solve mutual problems. I won't exclude the possibility that those who are inciting the rise of Russian chauvinism simply can't see the possible effect of this.

[Chernov] I would venture to disagree with you on this point. People in the office at Staraya Square are not so foolish that they can't foresee what will happen next. Ideas of national communism can thrive under different historical conditions.

[Sobchak] Indeed, the national card is being played by the communist structures who are clinging to power and ready to use any means which come to hand. I don't think the term "national communism" fits here—what we are dealing with is fascism, pure and simple. These people don't have any positive ideas to offer people. In fact, their ideas have been irrevocably discredited. They want to put through a plan, which has already misfired in Tbilisi and Vilnius, in Russia.

[Chernov] Is this going to be a decisive battle for them?

[Sobchak] It will be their last chance for discrediting democracy and its proponents. And they will do their utmost not to miss this chance.

[Chernov] But this would also represent a decisive step toward civil war, which, so it seems, no one wants.

[Sobchak] This would be a step toward the establishment of dictatorial rule, a relapse into the imperial totalitarianism of which we are only just beginning to break free. This return can be done only through force. They are perfectly aware of this. Let's see what the CPR [Communist party of Russia] Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee called for at their latest plenary meetings. The theme of force was quite apparent there.

[Chernov] How would you characterize the opposition: Gorbachev vs Yeltsin, in view of what you have just said?

[Sobchak] Have you noticed that this discord has been fanned by the reactionary press, and that every speech by Yeltsin causes a hysterical reaction from the right-wing? They concentrate on discrimination against Yeltsin as a person (and discrimination against the democracy he symbolizes). Yeltsin and the leadership of the Russian Federation are the most important obstacles to the restoration of Stalinism in Russia and the USSR, as well as to the restoration of the monopoly of the Communist Party.

[Chernov] But how dangerous can the confrontation between the two leaders be for the fate of the country and democracy?

[Sobchak] I think that this confrontation may have a dramatic result, since it takes place in the context of public impoverishment and is resented by the people. I admit that this is also part of a scenario opted for by the right-wing, who are biding their time until people tell both Yeltsin and Gorbachev to go. Many dream about Yeltsin and Gorbachev quitting the political stage. But that would spell the end of democracy in this country.

[Chernov] You mean to say that today the democrats also need Gorbachev to stay?

[Sobchak] Yes, both the conservatives and the democrats need it. The former are afraid that Gorbachev's removal would cause a popular upheaval, or at least the final disintegration of the CPSU. But the democrats sill can't form a government and remain in power. They would be washed away by the advance of dictatorship. The experience of last year proves that the democrats are still unprepared to exercise power in the interests of the people either on municipal or republican levels. We still have a lot to learn about how to act in opposition.

[Chernov] You mean well-organized opposition, don't you?

[Sobchak] Yes, this must be a well-organized opposition which could counterbalance communist structures in

real terms. We have effective popular fronts and political parties even on the scale of republics. There are nationwide democratic movements but they are not coordinating their work with their republican counterparts, and their political influence isn't large. However, the January events in the Baltics proved that we are fettered by one and the same chain, and this can be broken only through concerted effort. The chain represents the totalitarian past, but it is also an element uniting us in the fight for a democratic future. This means that democratic forces must rally together into one nationwide movement or one national party. Only a powerful counterbalance on a national scale can contain the imperial aspirations of the CPSU.

[Chernov] What is your vision of that movement or party?

[Sobchak] I think the socio-democratic trend will find the greatest response with the people. This will be something which people can understand and accept as an alternative to the communist utopia.

[Chernov] But what if the democrats fail to organize this nationwide movement?

[Sobchak] In that contingency, it would be impossible to avoid a return, though for a short time, to the CPSU's monopoly rule. But I do hope we will manage to initiate and organize a national alternative to the CPSU, enabling us to gain power by parliamentary means in the next election.

[Chernov] The most sensitive issue today is: how real is the possibility of civil war in the USSR?

[Sobchak] I don't believe in the reality of this eventuality. We are not dealing with a confrontation of classes or social forces. You can't seriously regard the so-called "shadow-economy operators" as one of the opposing centres of social polarity (viz. the Leningrad TV reporter Nevzorov). People at the Communist Party headquarters also know this and therefore prefer to play the national card rather than the class card.

[Chernov] But what about the armed forces and the repressive bodies? Isn't the virus of civil war being developed by them?

[Sobchak] The idea that the KGB and the army must be at the service of the people, rather than the CPSU, is beginning to spread through these organizations as well. Remember Romania's example.

[Chernov] I see that you remain an optimist.

[Sobchak] Yes, I do. And believe me, we are not heading for another civil war.

Social Scientists Draw Up Anticrisis Plan

LD0705161791 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow May 7 TASS—A group of Soviet political scientists that holds weight in local party and government circles has drawn up a programme to pull the country out of the crisis. Their new political doctrine, known as "Authoritarian Modernisation," envisages Chinese-type economic reform based on a "technological breakthrough" and a "tough authoritarian" political structure.

Ideologist of the "post-perestroyka period" Sergey Kurginyan, who told TASS about the new doctrine, believes the only way to save Soviet society from chaos and a dictatorship, both from the right and the left, is to rely on a "third force" and steer a centrist course.

Kurginyan is candidate of sciences (physics and mathematics). He is also president of the "Experimental Creative Centre" corporation, which has a turnover of approximately 100 million rubles, and chief stage director of the "Na Doskakh" (On the Boards) theatre.

Kurginyan is becoming quite prominent on the country's political arena. Although he has been Communist Party member only since 1988, Moscow Communist chief Prokofyev believes he is fit to draw up the draft of the Moscow Communist Party organisation's socio-economic programme. Some newspapers believe he is in high favour with Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. Kurginyan denies this, however.

According to Kurginyan, the centre's political forecasts are being received with interest in government circles, since they usually prove correct.

The "Authoritarian Modernisation" programme envisages "the creation of an enlightened and somewhat liberal authoritarian structure pursuing a tough policy of modernisation." Kurginyan believes this modernisation should be of the Chinese type.

"We must establish a mixed economy with a powerful state nucleus and quickly carry out a Chinese-style financial reform. It is necessary to get down immediately to the elaboration of economic plans—annual, three-year, etc." Kurginyan says. He believes it is necessary to "single out directions for technological breakthroughs and zones of growth."

From a political point of view, this programme calls for the "creation of a supra-party bloc, including statesmen of all orientations." In addition to the programme, they must also be united by a common desire to prevent the state's disintegration.

According to Kurginyan, Mikhail Gorbachev is "trying to adhere to strange all-reconciling language and to

actions that would be normal in ordinary conditions" instead of embarking upon the "Authoritarian Modernisation" centrist course.

USSR Expanding Cooperation With Interpol

LD0705195391 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] The Soviet Union is expanding cooperation with Interpol. The statement has been made by a spokesman for the Soviet Interior Ministry, Gennadiy Chebotaryev. The country entered Interpol a year ago and today its branch has over 20 top class professionals who take part in international conferences and operations to combat organized crime.

Economic

Coal Ministry, Trade Union React to Coal Accord

LD0705141891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers and USSR Cabinet of Ministers have signed a joint document on transfer of Kuzbass enterprises to Russian jurisdiction. After this event, the leadership of the country's Ministry of Coal Industry and of the industry's trade union suffered a state close to shock, according to one of the secretaries of the Central Committee of the trade union of coal industry workers. In his words, this action brings into doubt the success of the talks, which are nearing their end, between the miners' trade union and Ministry of Coal Industry on concluding an agreement on labor and social guarantees for the current year.

If other republics were to follow Russia's example, stated the trade union leader, who preferred to remain anonymous, the legal and financial basis of the agreement being prepared would disappear. The very existence of the Union ministry in its present shape, moreover, will be threatened.

Vorkuta Committee To End Strike 10 May

LD0805062991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0600 GMT 8 May 91

[Text] The Vorkuta strike committee has decided to stop the strike on 10 May. But as representatives of Severnaya and Oktaybrskaya mines reported to the POST-FAKTUM news agency, their enterprises will continue the strike, presenting their own demands. For example, miners of Oktyabrskaya mine demand the resignation of the mine's director; miners of Severnaya mine intend to make economic demands, primarily the demand to establish stable prices for a tonne of coal and a meter of work.

Situation in Kuzbass Begins To Stabilize

LD0605103891 Moscow TASS in English 1031 GMT 6 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Grigory Shalakin]

[Text] Kemerovo May 6 TASS—Coalminers began to produce coal in five towns of the Kuznetsk coal basin (Kuzbass) today.

This is a manifestation of a trend towards the stabilisation of the situation in the Siberian industrial region, first of all, in those areas where miners agreed to the transfer of coalmines to Russia's jurisdiction and were given guarantees of their full economic independence from the republican government.

As a result, the shortfall in the production of coal is diminishing in Kuzbass. There are prerequisites that some of a third of coalmines that are now at a standstill are also expected to resume operation in the coming days.

Their delegations left for Moscow to specify in the Russian Government a procedure for the transition of coalmines to the republic's jurisdiction and to sign appropriate protocols.

One-Third of Mines Remain Idle

LD0705230291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1231 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Excerpt] Kemerovo (Western Siberia), 7 May (TASS)—As became known here today, miners at yet another pit in the Kuzbass—the Oktyabrskaya pit in the town of Leninsk-Kuznetskiy—decided to start extracting coal. Although the number of mines at a standstill in the Kuznetsk basin is falling, one-third are still not working. Already more than 800,000 tonnes of fuel have not reached consumers since the beginning of May. The reasons for the idle mines are various. [passage omitted]

Some Mines Expected To End Strike

LD0805074691 Moscow TASS in English 0716 GMT 8 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Text] Kemerovo, Western Siberia May 8 TASS—Kuzbass miners are discussing a joint edict by the federal and Russian governments giving control of the area's pits to the Russian Ministry of the Fuel and Power Industries, which reached local strike committees today.

Experts are predicting that the measure will prompt 26 of the region's 75 underground mines that are still on strike to end the stoppage within the next few days.

Pits in Kuzbass, Siberia's largest coalfield, suspended operations in the beginning of March, demanding the

resignation of the federal president and cabinet and pay raises, but recently began returning to work one by one.

All 25 of the area's open-cast mines are in operation.

Miners' Strike Causes Production Shortages

LD0705204191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 7 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] Output worth about 5 billion rubles has not reached consumers as a result of the miners' strike. Coal amounting to 1.5 billion rubles has not been supplied to steelworkers, and nearly 1 billion rubles has failed to reach railwaymen and power engineers. According to a report by the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, 27 pits are completely shut down today. At the Severnaya pit, some coal is being mined but not dispatched.

Official Denies New Price Hike Rumors

LD0605221191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2030 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] The Russian Information Agency has reported that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers is preparing another major price hike in the second half of May. The scale of the rise in the cost of living can be seen from the fact that the customer will have to pay not 10 but 16 rubles for a kilogram of butter. But Anatoliy Komin, first deputy chairman of the State Committee for Prices, called the rumors about a new price rise the joke of a fool or clever provocateur. He said that today only a madman could take such a step, since the government has not yet sorted out the consequences of the previous change in prices. Well, we have got not long to wait till mid-May. Time will tell, as the saying goes.

Railway Workers To Receive 50-Percent Raise

LD0605102491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 6 May 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Railways Minister Konarev has stated that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers is increasing wages by 50 percent for a number of categories of railway workers as from today. In the words of the minister, this will increase the social protection of railway workers and will reduce the tension which has arisen in many collectives. That was a report from the POSTFAKTUM agency.

Unemployment Forecast of 30 Million for 1992

PM0805102191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 91 p 1

["Own Information" report: "Again We Have Nothing To Lose...."]

[Text] The following statistic was mentioned at the just-ended international seminar on problems of forming a labor market: By the beginning of 1992, according to certain forecasts, approximately 30 million Soviet people will find themselves without work. This is almost one-fourth of all those employed in the state sector, and in Moscow alone almost one-third will end up in the street.

Young people—those who do not have professional experience or qualifications—will have a particularly hard time. Last year, already, approximately 70 percent of school graduates in Central Asia were unable to find work. This year there will be still more of them. What is more, it is now the turn of higher educational institution graduates. This summer only medical and pedagogic institutes will be able to ensure the placement of their students and, thus, guarantee work for them. The rest will be seeking work on their own.

"The program to provide work is costing approximately 7 billion rubles," Ye.D. Katulskiy, deputy minister of labor and social problems, said. "We are now setting up an employment fund. Each oblast will have one. The main receipts are 1 percent of the labor remuneration fund, which enterprises will deduct. We are reckoning on using this money not only for retraining but also to pay unemployment benefits."

"When will it be possible officially to go to an employment exchange or employment service in order to register and receive benefit?"

"As of 1 July, when section 4 of the fundamentals of employment legislation comes into force. The amount of benefit will depend on the work record, the family situation, and readiness to attend requalification courses."

Decree on Insurance Compensation Adjustments

PM0805105791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 91 Second Edition p 2

["Decree of the USSR President" dated 6 May 1991: "On Compensation for Losses Incurred as a Result of the Depreciation of Citizens' Financial Savings Under Long-Term Contracts With USSR State Insurance Organs"]

[Text] In order to protect citizens' financial savings under long-term contracts with USSR State Insurance organs as a result of the one-shot retail price increase, I order the following:

1. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers' proposal providing for a one-shot revaluation of citizens' monies in the form of accumulated insurance contributions under long-term contracts with USSR State Insurance organs that were in force as of 1 March 1991 to compensate for losses incurred as a result of the depreciation is to be adopted.

Compensation is to be paid in accordance with the terms outlined by the 22 March 1991 USSR presidential decree

"On Compensating the Population for Losses Incurred in the Depreciation of Savings as a Result of the One-Shot Retail Price Increase" (VEDOMOSTI SYEZDA NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV SSSR I VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1991, No 13, p 391).

2. The USSR Ministry of Finance is to draw up a procedure for making compensation payments resulting from the one-shot revaluation of citizens' money resources governed by long-term contracts with USSR State Insurance organs.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, President of the USSR.

The Kremlin, Moscow, 6 May 1991.

Scientific

'Progress M-7' Spacecraft Jettisoned From Mir

LD0705174291 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondent at Mission Control Centre]

[Text] Moscow May 7 TASS—The unmanned Progress M-7 space freighter was jettisoned from the Soviet orbiting Mir platform at 02:00 today and is expected to burn up in the atmosphere tonight, while its heat-protected descent capsule will land in a preset area.

All planned operations involving the cargo spacecraft were performed in full—unloading delivered supplies, replenishing the station's stocks of fuel and oxidiser, and using the spacecraft's motors to correct Mir's orbit.

Cosmonauts Viktor Afanasyev and Musa Manarov, meanwhile, continue to work aboard Mir. Today they are busy setting up scientific equipment for scheduled experiments and undergoing regular medical checks.

Spacecraft Burns Up in Atmosphere

LD0805102691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0922 GMT 8 May 91

[By TASS correspondent at Flight Control Center]

[Text] Moscow, 8 May (TASS)— The automatic 'Progress M-7' automatic freighter, which was undocked from the 'Mir' scientific research complex on 7 May, has ended its flight.

A few hours after the separation, the cargo spacecraft was oriented in space by command from the Control Center, and at 1924 Moscow time its motor was turned on. As a result of braking, the 'Progress M-7' craft went into descent trajectory, entered the dense layers of the earth's atmosphere, and burned up.

Military

Marshal Kulikov Discusses WWII Victory

LD0705191691 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 7 TASS—"There are all grounds to believe that the imminent threat of a world nuclear-missile war has receded. However, the Soviet Union is still threatened militarily and will continue to be threatened while there are arsenals of nuclear and conventional forces and the confrontation between groups of armed forces," Soviet Marshal Viktor Kulikov told TASS in the run up to Soviet Victory Day, marked on May 9.

The former head of the Warsaw Treaty Armed Forces said that although the pact has been disbanded, NATO military structures still exist.

The United States is developing its nuclear potential and continues work on the SDI programme, Kulikov said.

"In this situation, complacency is impermissible. This is the lesson we learned from the great patriotic war," he stressed.

The Second World War had a great impact on Soviet life. It was a severe trial for millions of soldiers and workers and a tough test for the socialist society, he said.

"Our country passed this test with honours," he said.

Commenting on various stages of the war, the marshal said that the Soviet Army stood up to the deadly enemy and crushed it. Six months after attacking the Soviet Union, Hitler's troops were routed near Moscow. By the end of 1941, Soviet troops foiled the blitzkrieg and shattered the myth about the invincibility of Nazi troops. Later the Nazis suffered crushing defeats near Stalingrad and Kursk. In 1944, the Soviet Army chased the invaders out of the country and fought them in Eastern Europe.

"Hundreds of thousands of Soviet soldiers died fighting to restore (East European) countries' statehood. Victory Day is a historic holiday for many nations in Eastern Europe," Kulikov concluded.

Polozkov Meets With Defense Ministry Personnel

PM0705155591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Major A. Vorobyev report: "Meeting With Servicemen"]

[Text] I. Polozkov, first secretary of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee, met yesterday with the ideological and party aktiv of the main and central directorates of the Ministry of Defense. The discussion concerned the

results of the joint plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission.

As Polozkov noted, extreme opinions were voiced at the plenum. This, however, was not an upsurge of conservatism, as a number of the mass media tried to characterize the situation; it was the Communists' desire to get to the bottom of the extremely complex situation in the country and elaborate anticrisis measures to stabilize the economy.

The leader of Russia's Communists advocated the need for a political truce in the country and for the consolidation of society. In response to a question about the possibility of a state of emergency being introduced in the country, he said that it is a question not of "tanks on the streets, but special anticrisis measures that are necessary in order to stabilize the situation in transportation and the economy...."

Surkov, Shlyaga Address Committee Secretaries

PM0705092991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 May 91 First Edition p 1

["Our Correspondent" report: "Pooling Efforts"]

[Text] An instruction methods class for party committee secretaries from districts, groups of forces, and fleets was held recently. Lieutenant General M. Surkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the All-Army CPSU Organization party committee, delivered a report "On Immediate Steps To Implement the Decisions of the First All-Army Party Conference." The report emphasized that the ideological and organizational consolidation of party collectives and the formulation of concerted actions on the part of command, political, and party structures are important tasks in party committees' activity. The mechanism for this kind of cooperation has still not been fully perfected, but it will be based on regular reciprocal provision of information regarding plans for activity in key areas, exchange of work experience, joint political and educational measures, and coordination of efforts to uphold the vital interests and rights of servicemen, workers, employees, and members of their families.

With the direct involvement of the military-political leadership, the party committee is by and large successfully implementing measures pertaining to the organizational-staff formation of party structures, staffing their working apparatus with worthy, experienced cadres.

The second set of questions concerns the need to propagandize and explain the decisions adopted by the First All-Army Party Conference. It is important to tell people the essence of the fundamental transformations taking place within the system of party-political work in the Army and Navy, the crux of the tasks and functions facing new party organizations, and their role and place within the overall structure of the military organism. Within their new structure, party organizations should not, under any circumstances, confine themselves to internal problems.

Work to provide social protection for Communists, servicemen, workers, and employees is becoming a top priority task for party organizations and party committees in contemporary conditions. Party committees must resolve housing and other domestic issues and problems arising from the price hike in an enterprising way.

Major General V. Tkachenko, Rear Admiral A. Voronin, Colonel A. Khachikyan, Colonel S. Mikhaylov, and other comrades spoke during the class.

Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the Main Military-Political Directorate of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister, took part in the work of, and spoke at, the instruction methods class. He focused in detail on the results of the work of the Joint CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission April (1991) Plenum and the conclusions that Army and fleet party organizations must take into consideration in their practical activity. He especially stressed that ideological and educational work must be deemed the main area of joint activity for military-political organs and party committees. The specific areas of this joint work were stipulated.

Russian Presidential Election Instructions Given

PM0705122791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 May 91 First Edition p 1

["Direct Line" report by unnamed KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent: "RSFSR Presidential Election"]

[Text] Moscow—A conference was held 30 April at the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate at which its participants were familiarized with the main provisions of the Laws "On the President of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]" and "On the RSFSR Presidential Election," adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and the planned dates for the main events in the election campaign. Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the Main Military-Political Directorate and USSR first deputy defense minister, spoke at the conference. He stressed the tremendous significance of the coming election in deciding the future of Russia and the USSR as a whole and in resolving the pressing problems of socioeconomic transformations and extricating the country from the grave state of crisis.

In view of the extremely tight schedule for the election campaign it was recommended that organizational questions be settled energetically. By 10 June district election commissions must be formed and registered at all troop units on RSFSR territory in accordance with established procedure and polling stations kitted out. All questions of funding and provision of the requisite literature and communications systems must be settled urgently.

Given that many candidates may be nominated, voters must be helped to assess their positions and election programs, notably regarding problems of the country's defense and military building. This will require definite, analytical work and the formulation of the arguments in favor of or against the candidates for this important post.

It was emphasized in conclusion that now more than ever the country needs to have political stability and to advance toward its outlined goal in an atmosphere of accord rather than confrontation, which exhausts people and destroys the fundamentals of society's life. The attitude to possible RSFSR presidential candidates must be determined from these standpoints.

'Democrats' Anti-Army Sentiments Condemned

PM0705150591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 May 91 First Edition p 2

[Article by Marshal of Aviation I.N. Kozhedub: "People, Be Watchful!"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] As a military man, I cannot help expressing alarm at the state of our Armed Forces and their position in society. In March 1990, I considered it to be my duty to state, at the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, that the anti-Army campaign tha[illegible] being single-mindedly pursued by certain mass m[illegible], would inevitably lead to negative consequences. Its results are already visible. The prestige of military service has dropped below the tolerable level. According to data from sociological research, one-third of all young men who are draftees say that their parents do not want them to serve in the Army. Draft dodging and desertion have become widespread phenomena.

I find it difficult to understand and justify the actions of the country's leadership, which is trying with uncommon frivolity to transfer the militia's functions to the Armed Forces. These actions, which are sometimes totally unjustified, undermine the prestige of men in Soviet Army uniform. Discriminatory actions on the part of local authorities against servicemen have become widespread in recent years. In many regions in the country the situation regarding apartments for officers and warrant officers has deteriorated—they cannot obtain residence permits, their wives cannot find jobs, they cannot place their children in schools and kindergartens, and it is difficult for them to obtain coupons for food and industrial goods. All this is forcing even young officers to think about being discharged into the reserves. It has become particularly difficult to serve in republics where the Army is considered to be foreign, and Soviet servicemen are openly called occupiers.

It was not said by us or in our times that the people who do not wish to support their own Army will support a foreign one, but these words serve as a timely warning for us. I am not a "hawk" or a militarist; I am first and foremost a man who has had to become very well acquainted with the troubles of the front. As a military man, I know better than most how harsh the consequences of blunted vigilance are and how high the price you have to pay for excessive gullibility in international affairs.

We support perestroyka, glasnost, pluralism of opinions, true democratization of life, and a multiparty system. People are free to be Communists or Socialists, or members of any other party. I am outraged, however, at the aggressiveness that is to be encountered at rallies of those who, under the slogan of democratization, are trying to revive the cult of "one sole correct opinion," who win the masses not by the attractiveness of their political and economic programs but by trenchant appeals such as "Out With...!" "Down with...!" and "Put... on trial!" These slogans, as has already happened frequently, lead to pogroms, violence, and finally to dictatorship. Do not believe those double-dealers who only yesterday praised the party unreservedly and had leading roles in it, but today are demanding that a kind of Nuremburg trial be instituted against it.

Whom do the activists who consider themselves democrats intend to put on trial? The political instructor and the commissar who were the first to attack with the call "Communists, forward!" Servicemen who blocked the gun-port of an enemy pill-box? The soldier who was killed and whose party membership card pierced by a bullet has been preserved in the museum? The communist pilot who rammed an enemy aircraft with his own to prevent it from bombing civilians?

How you must dislike your people and your history to demand that patriots of the motherland be tried! How morally blind you have to be to listen to such appeals indifferently!

I believe in the collective reason of our society, I believe that everything alien and bad that is mixed up in ambitions and party dissension will be thrown out and the sacred ideas of the unity of peoples and state integrity will take precedence over the policy of national egoism. I believe that the front line fighters' feats will not be forgotten and our Army will not stop enjoying the people's love and trust.

Defense Ministry Spokesman on Shorter Naval Terms

LD0305140491 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 3 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 3 TASS—"The question of reducing the term of active duty for the petty officers and seamen of the Navy and naval units of the KGB border forces from three years to two requires an immediate solution," Colonel General Grigoriy Krivosheyev, deputy chief of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff," told TASS today.

He spoke on the eve of an expected discussion of the issue in the Soviet parliament within the first ten days of May.

A decision to this effect would become "one of the first major practical steps in refining military service procedures," General Krivosheyev said.

At the same time a shorter term of duty in the Navy may have negative consequences "from the viewpoint of decline in the professional preparedness of Navy ships' crews," the general said.

In order to make up for the decline, the Soviet Defence Ministry intends to come up with a proposal to the Soviet parliament to carry out an experiment in the Navy by manning Navy ships with petty officers and seamen who would join the Navy under a contract, Krivosheyev said.

In that case they will be paid according to rates set for extended service men, he added. "The outcome of the experiment would make it possible to reveal realistic possibilities for the establishment of a professional army in the country," Krivosheyev pointed out.

Expressing the opinion of the leadership of the Defence Ministry, General Krivosheyev said that a parliamentary decision to this effect would also made it possible "to restore social justice among citizens in the performance of their constitutional duties."

"Such a step would be welcomed by broad sections of Soviet society," Krivosheyev said.

Reasons Given for New Probe Into Submarine Loss

PM0205135791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 May 91 Union Edition p 3

[N. Burbyga: "Returning to the Komsomolets Again"]

[Text] As reported earlier in IZVESTIYA (No. 81), the Main Military Prosecutor's Office has reopened the investigation into the loss of the nuclear submarine Komsomolets. Colonel A. Korotkov, deputy chief of the Main Military Prosecutor's Office Investigation Administration, told our correspondent about the reasons that prompted the military lawyers to return to the tragedy that took place in the Norwegian Sea two years ago:

We have been forced to embark on an investigation of the circumstances and causes that led to the loss of the submarine because the report of the government commission that investigated the causes of the loss of the submarine failed to throw light on this tragedy.

Vice Admiral Ye. Chernov, reserve, maintains, as before, that the nuclear-powered vessel had a high buoyancy and was very reliable in service. As a result, the blame for what has happened falls on the crew, which, despite its courage and heroism, was not prepared for operating in a critical situation on such a unique craft as the Komsomolets; therefore, it was unable to save the craft or its own lives. Responsibility for this must be accepted by specific fleet leaders.

For their part, surviving crew members claim that the ship let them down. We were told, they say, that it was very viable; therefore, we acted in accordance with instructions. Having sealed off all compartments, we waited for help to arrive. Vice Admiral Chernov, reserve, cannot be objective because he was a member of the state commission which accepted the submarine for service....

In the near future we will hear Chernov and other senior officials.

Let me repeat, however: Only after the submarine has been raised will it be possible to establish an accurate picture of the tragedy that took place.

Soviet Cruiser Leaves Black Sea for Arctic

LD0605160491 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 6 May 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Yuriy Skiba]

[Text] Nikolayev May 6 TASS—The "admiral of the fleet of the Soviet Union Kuznetsov" heavy air-capable cruiser, made at the Black Sea shipbuilding amalgamation, today set out from here, heading for the Arctic to join the Northern Fleet.

Its main combat purpose is to defend Soviet ships that are outside the range of friendly coast-based aircraft.

The cruiser's departure for the first long-distance voyage was preceded by an extensive programme to test its seagoing and combat qualities in the Black Sea.

Baltic Republics

Baltic Leaders Pay Official Visit to Washington

LD0705162191 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0900 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] The leaders of the Baltic republics have arrived in Washington, where they will meet the U.S. Government. In the second half of today, the republic leaders will take part in a session of the U.S. Helsinki Commission. Tomorrow, Ivars Godmanis, Edgar Savisaar, and Vytautas Landsbergis will meet U.S. President George Bush.

Attend Congressional Committee Meeting

LD0705203491 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1730 GMT 7 May 91

[Excerpt] Visiting Washington are Ivars Godmanis, the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Latvia; Edgar Savisaar, the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Estonia; and Vytautas Landsbergis, the chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania. They took part in a session of the Helsinki Commission of the U.S. Congress this morning. There was a discussion of the problems of independence in the Baltic states. We give an account of Ivars Godmanis' speech, as provided by Voice of America.

Ivars Godmanis expressed satisfaction at the chance to address U.S. Congress members, at the beginning of May in particular, because at this time 46 years ago a world war ended in Europe. The consequences of the war, however, are still to be felt, especially in the Baltic states. Ivars Godmanis said that the chance given him to speak to the Helsinki Commission of the U.S. Congress is testimony to the fact that the government of the United States of America recognizes the democratically elected governments forming in the Baltic states. [passage omitted]

Washington Activities Reported

LD0705224691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] The Supreme Council chairman of the Republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis, is continuing his visit in the United States. Today, he addressed the American Congressional Helsinki Commission. According to Radio Liberty, the leader of the Lithuanian legislature has urged the United States not to sign any agreements with the Soviet Union until the Kremlin has begun the promised negotiations on the Baltics' independence.

Both the Estonian and the Latvian prime ministers, Edgar Savisaar and Ivars Godmanis, also addressed the Helsinki Commission hearings today.

During a ceremony at the U.S. Capital today, the three Baltic leaders are to sign along with members of the U.S. Congress the charter of the new inter-parliamentary group for the support of human rights and democracy in the Baltic states.

Tomorrow, a meeting is planned between U.S. President George Bush and the Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania.

Yesterday, Vytautas Landsbergis the Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Vlademaras Katkus, who is accompanying him, met representatives of the Lithuanian World Community and American businessmen.

Tallinn Interrepublican Meeting Examined

PM0805100191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent L. Levitskiy: "Path to Agreement Is Reality"]

[Text] Tallinn—The terms are already familiar: War of laws, constitutions, and sovereignties. Will one more political neologism not be added to them? The war of most-favored nation statuses? The latest Tallinn meeting of representatives of republics held 15 and 26 April makes you wonder.

The first meeting was held nine months ago and was far less representative in terms of the number of participants and of observers from the European countries. They are following with interest the development of what is for the USSR the unusual process of the breakdown of the centralized economy into its components and the replacement of the republic-center-republic vertical economic ties with direct republic to republic ties.

It is natural that the Estonian leaders acted as the initiators of this process. They realized that the dissolution of such a long marriage will hardly be a friendly parting, that you cannot immediately separate policy and economy which are so thoroughly interwoven. While they are united, we must manage to create new ties, both political and economic, with the republic, ties that exclude the center but guarantee the influx of raw material from Russia, the Ukraine, and Central Asia. Also guaranteeing the sale of Estonian articles on the Eastern, vast, bottomless, and consequently undiscriminating market. It has so happened that both the light and the heavy industry of the republic are kept alive by the East and earn their living in the East. Only by preserving the rear services is it possible to reorient the economy toward the West and establish a bridge between East and West.

Nine months is a sufficient period for such stormy times. So far I cannot, unfortunately, present in detail the fruit of the process that was begun nine months ago but that is undoubtedly developing. The majority of documents adopted at these meetings in Tallinn were not published and the press has not managed to get hold of them—they are for official use. We are left with merely judging by the situation in the republic. It is as follows. Estonia has

quarreled with the union authorities. The influx of resources under direct contracts is scant. If you compare the Estonia of the March-April 1991 model with the Estonia of the previous years (it is embarrassing to even mention the Estonia of the year before last) then you are gripped with nostalgia and despondency. That is not the subjective conclusion of the author of these notes. The union of labor collectives has gathered the leaders of all republican enterprises and organizations of Tallinn. The subject of the talk was the prospects for life in the immediate future. The newspaper VECHERNIY TALLINN briefly conveyed the view of the majority: "In the USSR interregional ties will be destroyed. The supply of fuel and food will be broken off. The plants will come to a standstill as, within six months, will the Baltic and Estonian state regional electric power stations: There will be no chemicals to clean the boilers. Famine awaits us, and the bigger the city, the greater the threat of famine. Disturbances will break out. The public law and order organizations will be powerless. The economic aid from the West will obviously cease completely. Obviously, some citizens will have to be evacuated to rural regions. A full-scale ration card system will be needed. There will be no medicines, hospitals and children's institutions will have to be closed. Each person will have to save his family himself."

I have discarded many details of this black scenario. Even without them the picture is grim. The only consolation, and that was also mentioned at the meeting of leaders, is that on instructions from the government reserves have been building up in Estonia for three months now. The task of creating a reserve has been entrusted to 28 consumer cooperative enterprises and four trade points. It is true that it is not known whether the ruling is being fulfilled.

Today a very large number of people are following with alarm the relations between Estonia and the USSR. The statement of the leaders of nine republics and the country's president was both hopeful and worrisome. An opinion probably shared by the majority was voiced in the newspaper PYAEVALEKHT by Yu. Kakhn, Estonia's permanent representative in the USSR. He believes that the conference in Moscow is a step toward creating a normal society. The statement that was adopted is constructive. It does not contain the usual attacks on the six republics that have announced their withdrawal from the USSR. It is true that Kakhn is sure that the Kremlin will not voluntarily give Estonia its freedom. The refusal of most-favored-nation status will be a serious ordeal for the six. It "could close Estonia's route to the Eastern market. The USSR will start to refuse Estonian goods or will pay for them in rubles, which is extremely disadvantageous. In that case it is important how the West treats the USSR's actions and whether Estonia will be able to break down the Western border and introduce its own currency." Estonia is not strong enough to create trade with the USSR at world prices. It buys petroleum products alone to a sum of over 1 billion rubles. Where to take billions of dollars? Nor can it break down the border in the West. Especially as it will have to pay in real hard currency. There remains one thing—keeping the Eastern border open, retaining and augmenting trade turnover with the East, with the Union or its republics—otherwise there will be no escape from poverty. There remains the hope pinned on the Tallinn meetings, or reaching agreement with the aforementioned congress of people's deputies by acquiring independence.

The Estonian Government, formed by the leader of the People's Front, is criticized and cursed for much today. In any case, one must pay it its due—it has been able to predict and work steadily for the day when politics must inevitably merge with the economy. The Tallinn meetings are sufficiently reliable protection from the center. The documents signed during all these meetings are the basis for a future treaty, an alternative to the Union treaty.

The participants in the Tallinn meetings undoubtedly have different political aspirations. They have been brought closer together by the possibility of seeking nonstandard ways of overcoming the crisis and civilized forms of transition to market relations. Undoubtedly by disillusion, first with the intellectual and then with the administrative potential of the center. For some republics direct horizontal ties are an addition to the centralized distribution of resources, to mutual commitments or the state order. For others, which have declared themselves states, it is the only road to independence and they are hacking out this path persistently, assuming the initiative that should have been displayed and encouraged by the Union organizations.

I shall name the questions discussed at the present fifth session in Tallinn. The declaration on economic cooperation between governments in the transitional period and the basic principles of organizing trade exchange between the republics for 1992. Questions of foreign economic relations: The allocation of currency and the currency debt. Was the initiative in May for the heads f the republics' governments and of the Moscow and Leningrad city soviets to meet and examine all the republics' currency business and currency debts not an attractive one? Surely the representatives of 12 republics (Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia, the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Tadzhikistan, Moldavia, and Estonia) would not have met in Tallinn a day after the Moscow conference in the absence of mutual interest and attraction? After all, for the majority at any rate, it was not for the sake of political frondeurism that they met but through fear of letting slip a likely chance of extricating themselves from the quagmire of the crisis by helping each other.

For that reason the words uttered by USSR People's Deputy A. Sobchak, chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet, on the importance and role of the Tallinn meetings seemed no exaggeration to many journalists.

"I hope," he said, "that the concept of the Tallinn process will be used as widely as the concept of the Helsinki process and will have the same beneficial results."

He explained why:

"First, because it gathers people who are of almost the same opinion. People interested in creating normal economic relations. Second, we are developing them on the horizontal level, on the basis of bilateral and multilateral relations, without the participation of Union organizations. Third, thanks to the creation of this new economic structure, we have essentially laid the foundation to the formation of a new Union of sovereign states. Whereas at the Union level, in the Union legislature, in the Federation Council, and at the Union Government's numerous meetings with the leaders of the republics, this is mentioned but nothing is done; we have taken real steps to create a Union of sovereign states. Following the new economic structures new political structures will inevitably appear...."

I asked A. Sobchak to specify what steps have already been actually taken to form the new Union.

"I see the creation of this Union not in political declarations and talk about how we need it but in the republics' real cooperation. Furthermore, I believe that the documents we have signed make up a good basis for creating a common economic space, for satisfying common economic interests. For resolving those questions that we have, for a long time, vainly been trying to resolve at Union level, with the Union leadership.

"I see a certain consonance in this," he continued. "A consonance between the documents adopted here and the published statement by the 10. They have direct points of contact. We are advancing in different ways toward the same goal. From different positions, so to speak."

A little later, answering a question, E. Savisaar "corrected" this statement:

"The statement by the 10 was adopted from united political positions."

Estonia's Savisaar on Selling Shares to Workers

LD0605110291 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 5 May 91

[Interview with Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar by (Toomas Kutti) in the White Hall of Estonian Radio on 5 May—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Kutti] At noon today a live debate came to an end in the White Hall of Estonian radio on the subject of ownership reform and land reform. [passage omitted]

[Savisaar] In certain areas we can resolve ownership issues even now because—one way or another—certain solutions are the correct ones. This has already been demonstrated by the practice of other countries, and internally, in Estonia, the opinion in respect of them is uniform, both in respect of small privatization which has already begun as well as...[changes thought] At its last session, the government proposed to sell 5-20 percent of the shares in a state-owned joint-stock company to workers of the joint-stock company. This has not yet reached work collectives, I imagine—an understanding of this—but I think that in two to three weeks this will hit them and will also become a very serious subject of debate. It will indeed mean issuing shares worth about a couple of hundred of million [rubles] and this should indeed considerably raise any sense of ownership and motivation to work within enterprises. [passage omitted]

Estonian Minister Discusses Economic Problems

LD0705185291 Tallinn International Service in English 2030 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] At a government-sponsored meeting of Estonian economists last Friday [3 May] the most acute economic problems facing Estonia were said to be the emigration of highly qualified (?workers) to the West, the emergence of unemployment, and the slow pace of privatization.

At the meeting, which was attended by Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar, Minister of Economics Jaak Leimann also said that Estonia would lag behind in the area of technology for at least the next 40 years. He also said that Estonia would be dependent on different regions of the Soviet Union in one way or another for at least five to 15 years. Within the same period Leimann said that the overall economy will remain dominated by state monopolies.

Estonian Communications Ministry's Future Viewed

LD0805085291 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 0900 GMT 7 May 91

[Interview with Communications Minister Toomas Somera by correspondent Juhan Virkus; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Virkus] May is also a time of big changes for communications. Minister Toomas Somera, what then is to become of the Ministry of Communications in May?

[Somera] According to government resolutions, financial-economic activity in the spheres of postal communications and telecommunications will be separated. That means that on the basis of enterprises that currently are being administered by the Ministry of Communications two state-owned entereprises will be established: Estonian Post and Estonian Telecommunications. At the same time as these two state-owned enterprises are being set up—according to a Supreme Soviet law—the Republic of Estonia Ministry of Communications has been abolished as of 1 May, and the Republic of Estonia Ministry of Transportation will be reorganized into the Ministry of Transportation and Communications.

[Virkus] What will become of press distribution?

[Somera] At the moment, a whole string of leasing agreements is being prepared for press distribution enterprises. A section of them will be leased out directly—lock, stock, and barrel—and a section—together with the current Estonian press distribution association's central apparatus—will also be leased out with all its property, with the aim of subleasing in the second half of the current year. Furthermore, the issue aimed at complete privatization will be examined in the near future.

[Virkus] We have also heard that in the sphere of telecommunications the essence of the work is also changing, what with contacts with the Swedes and so on and so forth?

[Somera] Well, yes, there are indeed numerous changes in the essential work—namely, the republican Supreme Soviet adopted a new Republic of Estonia law on communications at the beginning of the year. This law on communications will also result in changes in principle, and indeed particularly in the sphere of telecommunications. Namely, this law permits a multitude of forms of ownership in the sphere of telecommunications; it will no longer all be only state owned. Of course, this will not come about overnight but the possibility is there in principle. Indeed, one aspect of separating post and telecommunications is related to planning major cooperation programs with communications administrations of foreign countries and foreign firms—first and foremost with the Swedish and Finnish colleagues and also with communications-related organizations and firms. This cooperation will expand considerably once we have separated post and telecommunications from each other.

[Virkus] It is quite natural that if we want to integrate into Europe we will also have to establish good links with Europe.

[Somera] Yes, here we will have to—both in the sphere of post as well as in telecommunications—restore the Estonian state's membership—with full rights—in the Universal Postal Union, in the International Telecommunication Unions, and in other international communications-related organizations, so the sphere of international work will expand considerably.

[Virkus] Once splitting up property has been completed in May, once new leaders take up their posts and new masters have emerged, will letters then no longer travel via Moscow? Will we be able to telephone from Tallinn directly through to Stockholm, Paris, New York?

[Somera] Well, here of course the situation is much more complicated. Letters and postal parcels to some degree already travel direct—well, from Finland, Sweden, and Denmark, and some other states—but to a large extent post still goes via Moscow so this all boils down to the issue of our independence, to the issue of restoring our membership in international organizations—and that also in the sphere of telecommunications—so we will undoubtedly be speaking with Finland and Sweden through direct channels. Unfortunately, however, as long as we do not reorganize our international communications completely—which will cost an awful lot in hard currency and... and this is what cooperation issues with other countries come under—and as long of course as numerous calls will—apart from Scandinavia—undoubtedly be put through via Moscow.

[Virkus] As indeed the splitting of property will take place in May, and jobs will be allocated, on 7 May you indeed used to be together, around a table, to discuss work problems and to celebrate communication-workers day, their holiday. Is this so today, too?

[Somera] Yes, indeed, today I would like to hope that this kind of proper cooperation between colleagues would continue. We have hardly anything to split here, we both stand for the interests of the Estonian people, so that we must separate this communication sphere. [sentence as heard]

Latvia Demand Price Decreases, Union Treaty

LD0805091591 Moscow All-Union Mayak Network in Russian 0430 GMT 8 May 91

[Text] Representatives of 42 labor collectives, strike committees, and public and public-political organizations in Latvia have issued a statement addressed to the Latvian republic's Supreme Soviet and government. This statement contains the demand that prices at all goods and services be reduced to all-Union levels and the decision to hand over land to former owners and their descendants be rescinded. It also demands that the Union treaty be signed. A reply must be received by 14 May. If these demands are ignored, the statement says, measures in response by the working people of all the nationalities living in Latvia will be worked out.

Latvian Meat, Dairy Production To Be Reduced

LD0605223691 Riga Radio Riga International in English 2030 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] According to the prognosis of the Ministry of Agriculture, the production of milk and meat in Latvia will be reduced for 9 percent this year. Due to the problems with the feed and lack of the state subsidies in the situation of the coming market economy, most problematic will be the poultry breeding and the production of dairy products. During the first 3 months, the amount of dairy products has decreased for 17 percent and meat for 13 percent. The number of cattle in the collective farms decreased together with a general tendency of the collective farm system breakdown, at the same time increasing in the individual farms, and giving hopes that with the help of radical economical measures taken by the Latvian Government, the situation can be changed for the better next year.

Riga OMON Commander Shot, Sustains Wound

PM0705080991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 91 p 1

[K. Markaryan report: "We Are Also Against Shots at Point-Blank Range..."]

[Text] Cheslav Mlynnik, commander of the Riga OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] is unlucky. Or is he? He was attacked in broad daylight as he was coming home from work Saturday 4 May. Pistol shots were fired at Mlynnik near his apartment.

The victim is now in a military hospital. The superficial wound caused by a bullet has not put his health in jeopardy. The Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Prosecutor's Office has instituted criminal proceedings; however, will the culprit or culprits ever be found? After all, it has still not been established who fired automatic weapons at Ch. Mlynnik's and A. Nevzorov's car during the night of 3 February.

Lithuanian Says USSR Uninterested in Talks

LD0705181191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Russian 1100 GMT 7 May 91

[Interview with A. Azubalis, Lithuanian Supreme Council press spokesman, by Radio Vilnius Russian service correspondent; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpt] [Azubalis] [passage omitted] I should like to say, or rather I should like to quote what Supreme Council Deputy Chairman Ceslovas Stankevicius said concerning the negotiations with the Soviet Union. He said that he has the impression that so far the Soviet side is not interested in negotiations with the Republic of Lithuania. He said that unsuccessful attempts by the Lithuanian leaders, including him personally and Minister Without Portfilio Aleksandras Abisala to contact the leaders of the Soviet side for negotiations with Lithuania testify to this.

Concerning the signing of the treaty with Russia, which has been approved in principle by both Ceslovas Stankevicius said that (?something may come out of it). [passage omitted]

Prunskiene on 'Sober Approach' to Independence

PM0805102391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 91 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed "Opinion for Export" feature citing FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE interview with former Lithuanian Prime Minister K. Prunskiene]

[Text] Kazimiera Prunskiene, former prime minister of the Lithuanian Government, has advocated a considered, sober approach to the implementation of the idea of independence.

In an interview given to the FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE's weekly supplement she noted that declarations of sovereignty will not change the existing state of affairs. It is scarcely to be imagined that the Lithuanian Government can achieve what it desires while locked in resolute combat with the Soviet authorities. One example is the demand for the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania. "We possess neither the military nor the economic might to be able to solve this problem so quickly," Prunskiene stated. "In this regard it is essential that we alter the way we treat Soviet servicemen. Officers need apartments. The reluctance of certain city management organizations to allocate them housing makes officers indignant, which is a serious problem. I cannot, for instance, allow myself to hate someone with whom I will have to maintain contact in the future."

Regarding the reasons for the resignation of the government she headed, Prunskiene stressed that the intolerant, hard line adopted by Vytautas Landsbergis was the basis of the conflict. According to her, the legislture headed by Landsbergis constantly interfered in the government's work, supplanting the executive power. The government was supported only by left-wing forces and center parties, yet the majority in the legislature was clearly rightwing. I did not agree with the peremptory, uncompromising actions taken against Moscow. Radical statements about independence are so much hot air; policy needs specific content. Our democracy is in an embryonic state. It was precisely these ideas of mine that served as the pretext for a charge of betrayal when I came out against Landsbergis.

Life is not just black and white, it is far more multihued, particularly in politics. The monopoly of power was exercised by Moscow for decades. It is now being exercised by the rightwingers in the legislature, who are expelling former communists from leading organizations and pursuing an anticommunist and anti-Soviet policy.

Lithuanian 'Future Forum' Stances Noted

LD0805083991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] The Ideological Department of the Central Committee of the pro-Moscow Communist Party in Lithuania forsees serious prospects for development of the Lithuania Future Forum.

A statement was read on occupied Lithuanian television, which noted that the orientation of the Future Forum contains many points that are in common with the pro-Moscow Communist Party, while the Forum's activities and documents contain many ideas that are expressed in the Communist Party's documents and its press.

The Coalition Council of the Future Forum, which was established approximately one month ago, is in truth viewed by society as an opposition to the parliament's

policy. It has often and unambiguously come out in favor of Lithuanian independence, however.

Following the Coalition Council's announcement of its platforms, many of the republic's radical political forces dissociated themselves from it.

It appears now that the Future Forum itself, as well as its Coalition Council, will have to announce their dissociation from the Pro-Moscow Communist Party, which has voiced its support for it.

Plot Against Landsbergis Reportedly 'Ripening'

LD0705161991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 7 May 91

[Excerpts] Today the state newspaper LIETUVOS AIDAS carries a resolution adopted by the conference of the Lithuanian League of Liberty [LLL] that says that a plot inspired by communist forces against Supreme Council Chairman V. Landsbergis is ripening in the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania.

The LLL and representatives of various other parties who signed the resolution declared that in case Vytautas Landsbergis is overthrown by pro-Soviet left-wing forces, the LLL, together with other patriotic political parties and movements, will start open active resistance against [word indistinct] and collaborators. [passage omitted]

It was decided to listen to the information given by the LLL leaders, leaders of other parties, and the department for state security, to assess what in fact the situation is and if indeed a plot is ripening in the legislature.

After a heated debate, it was decided to include the issue in tomorrow's Supreme Council session agenda.

Lithuanian Official on Attacks on Customs Posts

LD0605145191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 6 May 91

[Report by correspondent Janina Mecelicaite from the Lithuanian Supreme Council building in Vilnius; date not given]

[Text] This morning Virgilijus Cesnulevicius, chief of the Border Service of the country's Defense Department, participated in a briefing held at the Supreme Council building. He presented a report on the assaults carried out against the Pavariskiai [word indistinct] customs post this weekend.

Cesnulevicius noted that he has spent the last two days either in Salcininkai rayon or at the country's Defense Department.

The first attack on the customs post took place on the night of Saturday Sunday [4-5 May]. A large group of drunks arrived from a dance held in Pavariskiai.

According to Cesnulevicius, disruption was caused by individuals who formerly were residents here, who come from Salcininkai, the Vilnius areas, and Belorussia. The attackers outnumbered the customs officials by four to five times. They [word indistinct] the customs staff, broke the customs office door, smashed the windows, beat up two of the staff members, and [words indistinct] on the customs post premises by car. This concludes the details of this incident.

The second attack against the [word indistinct] was carried out last night. The OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] participated in this one. At about 2300, some individuals arrived at the [name indistinct] customs post in three VAZ automobiles, and threatened that unless the country's Defense Staff members leave their posts they would return a second time and shoot them.

Virginijus Cesnulevicius told us that he took decisive action. He telephoned the OMON leadership. The conversation yielded some results—the OMON troops did not return a second time even though the OMON bosses asserted that the troops were not their people. These incidents are now under investigation.

RSFSR

7 May RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

LD0805021591

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 2058 GMT on 7 May carries a 60-minute program of recorded excerpts of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow on 7 May.

Boris Yeltsin chairs the session; he submits for discussion two draft laws on privatizing state property.

Deputy Maley takes the floor to present the draft law on privatization of state property. Privatization should be carried out in two stages. Since the population has not enough money to buy the main assets, the population should be given means of payment to ensure equal opportunities for all. Evaluation of republican property should be carried out. Maley outlines a schedule and procedure for privatization; labor collectives and working people should be given priority.

At 2108 GMT Deputy Petr Filipov presents a draft law which details forms of and methods for selling assets to the population, and deals with initial installments.

At 2117 GMT an unidentified deputy takes the floor to open discussion of the first draft law. He argues about certain provisions of the draft presented by Maley. Deputy Rebrikov then takes the floor to voice his considerations. Another deputy says there is a need to define those assets which shall not be privatized under any

circumstances. He warns about possible social tension which could arise if mistakes are made during privatization.

At 2126 GMT Deputy (?Zhigulin) takes the floor to say that state assets should be sold to the population and not simply distributed among everybody, for this could kill economic motivation. Deputy Gennadiy Alekseyev speaks in favor of giving priority to labor collectives during privatization. Deputy Tikhonov urges everybody to speed up the process of privatization as the basis of future economic development. People should become owners of the results of their labor. Deputy Rudkin speaks about people like teachers and pensioners who have nothing to privatize; they will be left out in the cold.

At 2137 GMT Ruslan Khasbulatov puts the first draft law to the vote; it is adopted.

At 2138 GMT Deputy Filipov takes the floor to invite deputies to vote for the second draft law. The second draft law put to the vote and rejected.

At 2141 GMT Deputy Serotkin presents the draft law on a state of emergency. He speaks about the task of reconciling in the law a need for tough measures with a striving to avoid abuse of human rights. The main difference with the relevant Union law is a strong system of guarantees included in the republican draft. A decree on introducing a state of emergency should be approved by the Supreme Soviet within 72 hours. The draft envisages that a state of emergency can be introduced for 30 days maximum, after which it should be extended by the Supreme Soviet or ended.

At 2147 GMT a deputy takes the floor to point out shortcomings in the draft, article by article. Deputy Surkov invites others to make amendments to the draft in the future and adopt it at first reading.

At 2152 GMT Khasbulatov makes his favorable comments on the draft and invites deputies to adopt it at the first reading. Voting on the draft takes place; it is adopted.

At 2155 GMT a representative from the conciliation commission proposes to vote on the second draft law on privatization again. He clarifies the amendments that have been incorporated in the draft. Voting on the draft takes place and it is adopted.

The program ends at 2158 GMT.

Yeltsin Signs Order on Monitoring Land Reform

LD0705174191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic [RSFSR], has signed an order on the strengthening of monitoring and practical help by the Russian legislature in carrying out land reform. The republican government program provides for large areas of land to be handed over from 1991 to 1995 to develop peasant farms, to extend personal farmholdings, and for orchards and market gardens. The document points out that the rates at which the reform is being carried out in different areas are not the same. In order to step up monitoring and to give practical help in the localities, the order gives RSFSR people's deputies elected in territorial constituencies the task of monitoring the results of the spring [as heard] period of the land reform in their constituencies before June this year.

RSFSR Presidential Election Amendments Reported

91UN1415A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

["Law of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic on Changes and Additions to the Criminal Code of the RSFSR and the RSFSR Code on Administrative Infringements of the Law"]

In connection with the adoption of the Law of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] "On Elections of the President of the RSFSR," the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR **decrees:**

I. To make the following changes and additions to the RSFSR Criminal Code (RSFSR VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA, 1960, No. 40, Article 591; 1990, No. 1, Article 3):

1. Edit Article 132 as follows:

"Article 132. Prevention of the exercise of an electoral right and the exercise of authorities of proxies

"The prevention of the free exercise by an RSFSR citizen to elect or be elected a people's deputy or the president of the RSFSR and to conduct a preelection campaign, or the exercise by proxies of candidates for people's deputies or candidates for RSFSR president of their authorities, if these actions are carried out with the employment of coercion, deception, threat, or bribery—

"are punishable by imprisonment for a term of up to three years or corrective labor for a term of up to two years."

2. In Article 133, change the words "for a term of up to three years, or corrective labor for a term of up to two years" to the words "for a term of up to five years, or corrective labor for a term of up to two years, or a fine of up to five thousand rubles [R]"

II. Make the following changes and additions to the RSFSR Code on administrative infringements of the law (RSFSR VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA, 1984, No. 27, Article 909; 1990, No. 1, Article 3):

1. Edit articles 40-1 and 40-2 as follows:

"Article 40-1. Prevention of the exercise of an electoral right and the exercise of the authorities of proxies

"The prevention of the free exercise of an RSFSR citizen of the right to elect or to be elected a people's deputy or the president of the RSFSR and to conduct a preelection campaign, or the exercise by proxies of candidates for people's deputies of candidates for president of the RSFSR of their authorities, if these actions are not associated with coercion, deception, threat, or bribery—

"entails the imposition of a fine on citizens in a sum of from R100 to R1,000, and on officials—R500 to R3,000.

"Article 40-2. The dissemination of false information about a candidate for people's deputy or a candidate for president of the RSFSR

"The dissemination by means of publication or other means of false information on a candidate for people's deputy or a candidate for president of the RSFSR for the purpose of influencing the outcome of elections—

"entails the imposition of a fine in the sum of from R100 to R1,000."

2. Add to Article 40-3, after the words "for candidate to people's deputy," the words "or for a candidate for president of the RSFSR;" change the words "against him" to the words "against them;" change the words "in the sum of up to R50 or corrective labor for a term of up to one month, with a withholding of 20 percent of wages" to "in the sum of from R100 to R1,000."

3. In Article 40-4, change the words "on citizens in the sum of up to R50 and on officials up to R100" to "on citizens in a sum from R100 to R1,000 and on officials, from R500 to R3,000."

III. Put this law into effect from the moment of its publication.

[Signed] Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet B.N. Yeltsin

Moscow, RSFSR House of Soviets, 25 April 1991

Ryzhkov Highlights Social Issues for Campaign

LD0705195891 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] Social guarantees are likely to keynote the election program of Nikolay Ryzhkov who has decided by a proposal of some work collectives to run for president of the Russian Federation.

The former national prime minister has expressed the hope that people will support his program.

Ryzhkov called attention to these provisions of his election platform: regulating the prices of essentials and helping veterans, women and other vulnerable sections of the population when the nation moves to the markets.

Democratic Russia Names Candidates

LD0505225791 Moscow TASS in English 2123 GMT 5 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Yuriy Kozmin and Andrey Surzhansky]

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—Members of the public and political movement Democratic Russia, which recently nominated Chairman of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin for the post of Russian president, on Sunday approved a list of candidates for the republic's vice-presidency.

The movement unites over 1.5 million people, according to some estimates.

Under the Russian law on the procedure for electing the Russian president, adopted at the end of April, candidates for the post of Russian vice-president will be nominated by a candidate for the Russian presidency.

The list proposed by the movement will soon be handed over to the chairman of the Russian parliament. It includes First Deputy Chairman of the Russian Parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov, Chairman of the Federal Parliamentary Committee for Science Yuriy Ryzhov, Russian Deputy [and] Historian Dmitriy Volkogonov, Chairman of the Russian Parliamentary Committee for Legislation Sergey Shakhray and Economist Grigoriy Yavlisnkiy, an author of the 500 days economic programme.

Some of the movement's members, who actively support Yeltsin's political course, stressed that "Yeltsin's choice of candidates for the vice-presidency will show how much he intends to seek support from this political movement".

Starovoytova Nominated For Vice Presidency

LD0405162891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1349 GMT 4 May 91

[Text] As you already know, the third congress of the Russian Social Democratic Party ended in Leningrad yesterday. The congress supported the nomination of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin as a candidate for the Russian presidency, and instructed the party leadership to begin talks with him to determine the actual conditions under which he will be supported both before and after the elections.

A vice presidential candidate has been proposed to Boris Nikolayevich. In the opinion of the Russian Social Democrats it should be Galina Starovoytova.

Yeltsin Holds Talks with Watanabe in Moscow

OW0705041891 Tokyo KYODO in English 0354 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] Moscow, May 6 KYODO—Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin on Monday reiterated his proposal that the search for a solution of the territorial dispute with Japan over four Soviet-held islands off northeastern Hokkaido should be left to the next generation of leaders of the two nations.

In a meeting with Japanese former Finance Minister Michio Watanabe, Yeltsin said wise leaders of the two nations should resolve the territorial dispute in the final stage of his proposed five-step approach toward a peaceful settlement of the territorial issue, Japanese officials said.

Yeltsin first floated his five-phase proposals, under which the long-standing territorial problem would be handled gradually over the next two decades, when he visited Japan in January last year.

The leader of the Russian Republic was quoted as telling Watanabe that the first phase of the five-step process has been accomplished by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan in mid April and that the two nations have now entered the second stage of the five-step approach.

Yeltsin has argued that the Soviet Union should first admit the existence of the territorial issue with Japan and that free economic zones should be set up on the islands in a second phase.

Yeltsin told Watanabe that he and Gorbachev had agreed that the Russian Republic, which administers the four disputed islands, has a right to establish free economic zones on the islands as a sovereign entity, according to the officials.

He proposed to Watanabe that agreements on exchanges in such fields as the economy, culture, and technology be concluded between Japan and his republic in the third step of the five-stage program.

In the fourth stage, Yeltsin has called for demilitarization of the islands.

Watanabe arrived in Moscow on Friday after visiting Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Sweden.

Watanabe, a ruling Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] faction leader and former chairman of the LDP Policy Affairs Research Council, met Gorbachev on Sunday.

In the meeting, Gorbachev was quoted as saying that it will take a long time to settle the territorial dispute.

Yakut Seeks Cooperation With Guangdong, Shenzhen

OW0505033491 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1000 GMT 4 May 91

[From the "Along the Path of Friendship and Cooperation" program]

[Text] Dear listeners, Ivanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Yakut Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR], in a talk with our station reporter (Marchenko), said that there are broad prospects for Yakut and China to enter into cooperation as partners, especially with Guangdong Province and the Shenzhen Special Economic Zone.

Ivanov, who is a people's deputy of the Soviet Union, visited China not long ago as a member of a Soviet Union legislative delegation. Before we present his talk to you, we would like to give you a brief introduction about Yakut.

Located in northeast Siberia, Yakut is a republic of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. Covering an area about six times that of [words indistinct], the republic is thinly populated, with only a little more than 1 million people. The area is rich in nonferrous metals, diamonds, gold, coal, and natural gas, which the Yakut Government leader believes forms a good foundation upon which Yakut can actively pursue foreign economic relations.

Touching on the broad possibility of developing industrial cooperation with China, Ivanov said: After visiting Guangdong and Shenzhen, I came to the conclusion that Yakut must purposefully enter the markets in southern China.

Until now, like the rest of the Soviet Far East, the Yakut ASSR has mainly relied on railways to develop trade relations with the provinces in northeast China. Ivanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Yakut ASSR, maintained, however, that it would be much cheaper to transport goods by sea. Besides, not as many goods are shipped to and from China by sea as compared with those shipped by rail. There are many ports in southern China, and Yakut also has convenient outlets. For example, Yakut can reach the Sea of Japan via its eastern ports.

Ivanov continued: The Guangzhou International Trade Fair was under way when we visited China. During a tour of the trade fair, I noticed that the consumer goods on display from Guangzhou and Shenzhen not only boasted a wide variety, but were also high in quality. In view of the shortages of such goods in Yakut, we would like to have mutually beneficial cooperation with the Chinese partners in this area first. In order to establish relations with companies in southern provinces of China, Yakut plans to participate in the next Guangzhou trade fair, slated to open on 15 September. It will be our first effort.

Our station reporter asked Ivanov: What are your specific suggestions to Chinese partners?

Ivanov answered: First of all, I think we need to elevate our economic cooperation with China to a new level. In addition to barter trade, we should also set up joint ventures. Right now I can say that there are two enterprises in Yakut that would very much like to try this kind of cooperation. One is the Yakut Leather Plant. The plant needs modern technologies to retool itself, and the Chinese partners' assistance in this regard will be very appropriate. In Yakut, there are abundant materials for leather production. A portion of the processed leather can be exported to China for settling accounts. Of course, we can discuss other ways to settle our accounts. The other enterprise that would like to cooperate with Chinese partners is the Yakut Tailoring Plant. In order to make stylish, high-quality fashions, the plant also needs modern technologies, which I believe are available in China.

Ivanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Yakut ASSR, said in conclusion: I would like to extend a welcome to those who are interested in these suggestions. The republic's doors for mutually beneficial cooperation are always open.

Protocol Establishing RSFSR KGB Signed

PM0705123191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 91 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "An RSFSR KGB Is Being Established"]

[Text] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and USSR KGB Chairman V.A. Kryuchkov signed a protocol 6 May on setting up an RSFSR KGB in accordance with a decision by the Congress of Russian People's Deputies. Senior officials of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers and of the USSR KGB were present.

The protocol enshrines the status of the Russian KGB as a Union-republic state committee of the RSFSR. It envisages that while the system of ensuring USSR state security will remain integrated, the powers of the USSR KGB and the RSFSR KGB will be demarcated, as will the resolution of a number of problems that are tackled jointly, and this will be clarified after signing the Union treaty. The need to strengthen the legal basis of the work of KGB organs and the need for their staffers to strictly observe the laws in force is stressed.

Sverdlovsk KGB Expels 'Degenerate' Members

PM0805153991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 91 p 1

[V. Sanatin report: "Party Meeting of Sverdlovsk's Chekists"]

[Text] The KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondents' office in Sverdlovsk has managed to acquire a rare document—the protocol of a Sverdlovsk KGB Directorate party meeting where the question of expelling "degenerates" from CPSU ranks was resolved.

Some time ago, the "Letter of the 64"—the number of directorate staffers who advocated the committee's departyization—came as a shock to the Sverdlovsk KGB Directorate. They wanted the massive, combat-able, and effective army of committee staffers to be transformed from minions of the CPSU apparatus into the mind, honor, and conscience of the people.

...They were expelled in disgrace. S. Baklanov, presiding, read out V. Solomin's statement on leaving the CPSU. Questions followed....

N. Sorvachev: "Which will be your guiding ideology in future?"

Answer: "That which is common to all mankind, a humanist ideology."

Yu. Bazhenov: "How will you continue to live in the collective?"

Answer: "The collective's interests are not necessarily just party interests...."

Khusnutdinov: "...This is degeneration. The situation is reminiscent of what is going on in soviets at various levels. Some 20 percent of people's deputies are schizophrenic and 30 percent are former criminals. Those who are now leaving the party are playing into the hands of these people's deputies... I am categorically opposed to these renegades' leaving of their own free will. I suggest they be expelled. From now on we must expose and expel them. How can it be possible to work in the Central Committee and be a depoliticized individual?"

From N. Sorvachev's speech: "Let me remind you that the new KGB Directorate chief proposed that resignations from the party be postponed until the end of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session. These comrades did not compromise, and this is neither honest nor proper. This exacerbates the situation in the directorate. My position is this: If you wish to leave the CPSU, then you must also voluntarily leave the KGB organs. In the event of other forces' coming to power we will all be dismissed, as they will not depoliticize themselves and will take our place."

As of 5 May, 13 individuals from the Sverdlovsk KGB Directorate have left the CPSU ranks.

RSFSR Manipulators Behind Vorkuta Strike

PM0505200091 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Dmitriy Kazakov article attributed to GLASNOST No. 18, 1 May 1991: "Strike on a Prescribed Theme"]

[Text] Vorkuta and Moscow—First, some figures—dry, but nonetheless eloquent. Every year our country extracts 710 million tonnes of coal, but it needs less than 500 million tonnes. The 210-million-tonne difference is the guarantee against unemployment for many thousands of miners. The Vorkuta mines, in total, produce 2.4 percent of the Unionwide volume of coal extracted. In other words, the total and permanent stoppage of all the Vorkuta mines might be painful for the Union's economy, but certainly does not spell disaster. The cost of Vorkuta coal is 43 rubles [R] a tonne, which makes it the most expensive in the Union (for comparison: Karaganda and Kuzbass coal is only one-fifth of that price—R9 a tonne). All Vorkuta's mines make a loss. And this small town itself—entirely a product of the last war and the feverish quest for new sources of hard coal to take the place of the German-occupied Donbass—is extremely costly to the country. The 210,000 people who live in Vorkuta are all, to a man, totally dependent on the coal extraction process—directly or indirectly. Day and night this unprofitable city that sprang up by accident beyond the Arctic Circle grits its teeth in perpetual frost, digging its unprofitable coal which is totally unnecessary to the Soviet economy in such enormous quantities.... This coal, these mines, and, in the end, the city itself have just one purpose—to give people work. As far as I can tell, they have no other purpose.

So isn't it surprising that since 1989 not a month has gone by in Vorkuta without visits—visits that seem to have left the entire surrounding tundra reeking irredeemably of politics? The People's Labor Alliance, "Democratic Russia," the DRD [expansion unknown], the Democratic Party of Russia, the Independent Miners Union—envoys from all these organizations simply adore Vorkuta. Boris Nikolayevich also visited the people of Vorkuta and promised—to tumultuous applause—immediately to allocate 50 (fifty) heated Ikarus buses to the miners. (True, he did not produce a single one of them—he probably forgot) N.I. Ryzhkov was here, too. After taking a look at life in Vorkuta, he immediately allocated Ikaruses, Ural trucks, and snow plows. (True, he did not make any promises, and nobody applauded him) So much for the preamble.

Now I propose to go on to the strike itself.

How It Began

The fact that there was to be a strike became known on the day of the "Statement of the Six." Utkin and Yakovlev, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputies from Vorkuta, arrived in the city from Moscow. While the former was on local television reading out B. Yeltsin's speech word for word as if it was his own, the latter was doing a lightning tour of the strike committees.

The next day economic demands were put forward—patently provocative and patently unfeasible. The objective was clear: The demands had to be such as to deliberately rule out all possibility of constructive talks with the government. Realizing this, A. Oreshkin, general director of the "Vorkutaugol" Association, promptly called Moscow—not the Ministry of the Coal Industry, but the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, because he knew fine well where the strike winds were blowing from. He could not get through to B. Yeltsin—only to R. Khasbulatov. In answer to Oreshkin's request, Khasbulatov said that he could not help him to find Boris Nikolayevich, because "there's no telephone where he is right now." And anyway "he's very tired today." R. Khasbulatov did not respond to a request to talk with the strike committees himself.

The strike began. To the surprise of the strike committees, the economic demands—for a 120-percent increase in wages—were met by the government. Mild panic ensued in the ranks of the strike organizers, because the miners, having gotten their way, were naturally ready to go back underground. On receiving this information, the Moscow "control panel" reacted speedily: The miners were called to a rally, where they were addressed by Deputy Uktin, back from Moscow, who is on Yeltsin's permanent staff. In impassioned tones he read out a fax copy he had brought with him of a "Resolution of the Vorkuta Miners' Rally." In the top left-hand corner of this document there was (and still is) the address: "Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment, Moscow." [Address of RSFSR Supreme Soviet building] The resolution of the rally of the Moscow miners of Vorkuta city culminated in a set of political demands. Rather bizarre demands in one respect—**the immediate resignation of the government which had met all the economic demands**. The miners, who were being used as a kind of disposable political commodity, did not understand what was going on, and continued the strike—though not all of them: 75 percent of the mines' personnel showed up for work, while the highest-paid section of the miners continued the strike.

An indelible impression was made on people by an extremely frank speech by V. Kopasov, Vorkuta City Soviet deputy, first deputy chairman of the Soviet, and strike committee chairman. **"We are in constant communication," Kopasov stated, "with Moscow, with Boris Nikolayevich personally.... Dictatorship is inevitable in our country, and we want the dictator to be Yeltsin. He will hang both Communists and democrats from the lampposts at long last."** A delightful prospect of universal political reconciliation, don't you think?

Everything Depends on Who's in Charge

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet leaders can draw on reliable support in Vorkuta in fulfilling their designs. Take, for instance, the above-mentioned Kopasov, a graduate of a remedial school. (Let us explain for the benefit of anyone not familiar with the term: This is a kind of special school for children of the mentally retarded, handicapped, and so forth.) But that's just the leadership, so to speak. When it comes to the rank and file city soviet deputies, there are a good many interesting people among them, too. For instance, Deputy Somov, who was

convicted of speculation. Or Deputy Bakhtin, chairman of the City Soviet Standing Commission for New Forms of Economic Management—he has two convictions for speculation. Deputy Rodionov, also with a previous conviction, holds no post, but he, too, is an exceptionally reliable and decent man.... In all, the Vorkuta City Soviet has eight people's deputies with previous criminal convictions. They are, as they used to say in the days of stagnation, a reliable instrument of the implementation of democratic ideas.

However, the most interesting figures in the Vorkuta political landscape are, without any doubt, RSFSR People's Deputies Utkin and Yakovlev. The labor of these elected representatives of the people is very highly paid, but by other than financial means, by such roundabout routes that it seems to be impossible to identify all the ins and outs. First, both of them are members of the Supreme Soviet, which is odd in itself—how come both these people from the same electoral district got onto the Supreme Soviet? Second, both of them, although they have apartments in Vorkuta, were granted housing in Moscow, too. Yakovlev, still milking the system, is in all probability soon to acquire a third apartment—in Leningrad. Third, both Deputy Utkin and Deputy Yakovlev received cars in Moscow with none of those vulgar miners' waiting lines stretching all the way to the Taymyr. According to the Vorkuta City Internal Affairs Department, 50 percent of the cost of the cars was paid for by the RSFSR Council of Ministers....

But now we are forced to shatter some of the idealistic illusions of the gullible contributors to the strike committees' fund about Krasnopresnenskaya democracy. The fact is that the striking miners themselves received **NONE** of this money. The strike committees' fund went mainly on sending members of the strike committee all over the Union and abroad, and also on sending Deputies Utkin and Yakovlev to Vorkuta and elsewhere. Hotel bills—R15 a day, expenses—R20 a day. (In other institutions the corresponding figures are R12 a day and R3.50 a day). In addition the strike committee issued R1,000 to Deputy Yakovlev "for tickets to England." Is there any need to tell you whom he accompanied there and who gave the strike committee these orders? (This R1,000 is hard to reconcile with a certain recent action by esteemed Deputy Yakovlev at Vorkuta Airport. Comrade Yakovlev made the airport employees give two charming young ladies seats on the plane out of turn. He assured the administration that if they did not evict someone, no matter whom, from the plane that very instant he would immediately "call Khasbulatov, who will fire all airport workers who do not show respect for RSFSR people's deputies." They evicted a war veteran and a woman with a child.) And that's not all, unfortunately.

The strike committee funds paid for numerous trips around the vast expanses of northern Russia by employees of the "Olen Espo" cooperative, whose office is in... the strike committee building.

Three members of the strike committee are staffers of this very cooperative. In the hunt for reindeer horn they traveled over half of Russia on your money, you esteemed gullible collectors of "material aid to the Vorkuta strike committees...!" Sorry if I've upset you. We can mail a free copy of the report on the investigation into the financial activity of the strike committee to all interested parties.

I almost forgot. One of the strike committee's accounts—worth R11,000—was opened in the name of Kopasov—the very same. I expect he and the administration of the "Olen Espo" cooperative will be very grateful to citizens for further donations.

Finally, to close the "cadre question" once and for all, allow me to report that **there are virtually no miners on the strike committee**. On the strike committee, which is supposed to "maintain a prestrike condition," there are people of other, no less honorable professions: Storozhenko, an insurance agent; Sheykhakhmedov, a worker from the "Olen Espo" cooperative; Filenko, a former barman with a conviction for speculation; plus a number of other very nice people.

Humanitarian and Other Aid

They say the miners went on strike because of their poverty and indigence, and nobody incited them to strike. Well, that viewpoint has the right to exist. A miner's work is tough, that is common knowledge. But it is also quite well paid, that is common knowledge, too. But how well? Well enough to refrain from exerting strike pressure on the government? Judge for yourself.

First of all, it must be said that the figure of R450 which has featured in various publications as an illustration of the miners' monthly wage is not up to date for Vorkuta and is not in accordance with reality. In the period before the strike, before the economic demands were put forward and wages were increased by 120 percent, the real figure was: minimum—R850, average—R1,250, maximum—R2,000 a month. The miners have 200 (two hundred) days leave a year.

By entering into barter deals the Vorkuta mines were also able to solve the consumer goods problem. "Oktyabrskaya" is a typical mine in this respect. It has a work force of 3,600. In the period immediately before the strike the mine received 4,100 video systems (VCR plus TV), that is to say, there are now miners who have two video systems each, 39 Volvo cars, hundreds of imported washing machines and sewing machines, and other consumer trifles that are useful in the home and pleasing to the eye. Incidentally, the secondhand stores in Vorkuta are overflowing with imported goods, and the prices are one-third lower than in Moscow....

Another question: What did the miners live on during the strike? Donations? No, we described above the fate of the donations; they never reached the miners.... The fact is that in March-April the miners were paid a 13th-month's wages—on average R800 per person, plus

the so-called "pitman's money"—R750-850 a head. In total—around R1,500 each. I think you can exist on rusks for a month or two. It is just enough to last until the "historic date"—12 June 1991. Especially since in the course of the strike there was no need for any special spending on food: Tens of tonnes of fish, canned food, and potatoes were supplied to Vorkuta by the most expensive method—by air (by passenger plane in fact) from Moscow and the Baltic region.

One last thing. Russian Premier I. Silayev announced the transfer of R41 million to "Vorkutaugol" Association for coal insurance. The money has already begun to arrive—unheard-of alacrity for our country. But here is a point that negates the premier's charitable act: "Vorkutaugol" **HAS NOT INSURED A SINGLE TONNE OF COAL.** And it doesn't intend to! The agreement with Comrade Silayev on insurance was signed by Comrade Sheykhakhmedov, **who has nothing to do with the strike, the strike committees, or the mines**—as I mentioned above, he is an employee of the "Olen Espo" cooperative.... Either I am missing the point, or the Russian premier is not telling the whole truth. Perhaps God, or the devil, or Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin himself will explain to us in a comprehensible manner: What does a cooperative that collects reindeer horns have to do with coal insurance or the strike?!

But that is not the most mystifying aspect of the financial activity of the Moscow-Vorkuta axis. There are far more interesting questions. Some are so vast they take your breath away, especially since there are no answers to them and, to all appearances, there are not going to be. For instance, what is the connection between the idea of Greater Armenia and the strike? A connection certainly exists, because the originator of the said idea—the Karabakh Committee—paid R50,000 into the strike fund. Or: What word from a "high and mighty" person would describe insurance money paid for uninsured coal?

God moves in a mysterious way.

The Intrigues of the Vorkuta Partocrats

In a party newspaper it is perhaps embarrassing to write that the only organs of power that did not lose their heads in Vorkuta were the party gorkom [city committee] and the militia. But that is the case. The gorkom was against the strike because both First Secretary Ye. Tereshchenko and Second Secretary N. Bondarets—professional coal miners with 20 years' experience—knew very well that a strike could easily lead to the death of the city of Vorkuta, the terminus of the Northern Railroad. The fact is that by mid-April the railmen were already at breaking point because of last year's R3 million fine, the consequence of the 1990 strikes. Directly dependent on the volume of coal shipments, they were paid peanuts and received neither the "pitman's money," nor the 13th-month wage, nor the "humanitarian aid" from the fraternal sovereign states of the Baltic. Therefore, on 15 April Section 8 of the Northern Railroad decided to present the strike committee with an ultimatum and start a counterstrike, which is to say a total blockade of the city. This action, which was averted thanks only to the diplomatic efforts of the Vorkuta CPSU Gorkom, would have swatted like a fly not only the strike but Vorkuta itself. Incidentally, it was largely the stance adopted by the railroad that had a sobering effect among the strikers, each of whom suddenly felt himself to be not so much a citizen of Vorkuta as someone living on a dead-end branch line of Section 8 of the Northern Railroad....

Day and night the gorkom exhorted, explained, and persuaded, engaging in shuttle diplomacy. It all ended well: The mines gradually began to emerge from the strike, and the railmen abandoned their drastic plans.

The militia was categorically opposed to the strike because, from the militia's point of view, the strike brought the city nothing but an increase in the number of domestic crimes and disturbances and an increase in alcohol consumption—from boredom. The "independent" press claims that during strikes there are no crimes at all, because the strike committees are such zealous guardians of law and order. I asked Vorkuta militia chief A. Gulaga to comment on this romantic idea.

"Are you kidding, or what?" Anatoliy Andreyevich asked.

I assured him that it had never entered my head.

The militia chief then told me that in response to a request from the Internal Affairs Department for help in maintaining law and order during the strike, the strike committees had assigned and sent along a certain Comrade Chizhikov, who has several convictions for hooliganism and is on probation. The militia did not make any more such requests to the strike committees, for fear that they would send someone even livelier.

Organizational Conclusions

We believe everyone should draw his own conclusions on the basis of the facts cited above, because nobody, and that includes us, has a monopoly of the truth. If you think you can detect a presence behind the striking miners, you're close to the truth. And if you think that the strikes are a spontaneous expression of the people's dissatisfaction, you're right again.

For our part, we will draw only one organizational conclusion: Vorkuta, which once before narrowly avoided being sacrificed to political ambition, would not survive a second strike on this scale. It is painfully fragile and precious, this bleak, unprofitable city beyond the Arctic Circle which grits its teeth day and night in the perpetual frost in the quest for coal the country doesn't need. A second strike, however carefully orchestrated, would be Vorkuta's epitaph.

...It has become known that the strike ended 28 April in connection with the transfer of Vorkuta's mines to Russian jurisdiction.

Leningrad To Vote on Reverting to St. Petersburg

LD3004174291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] A meeting of the Leningrad City Soviet has decided to conduct a referendum of the whole city in which residents will have to answer the question: Do you consider it necessary to restore the historic name of St. Petersburg to the city? It thus transpires that the option of calling it Petrograd—favored by many, among them the writer Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn—will not be considered.

If a majority of Leningrad residents answer the referendum question in the affirmative, then a final decision will be made by the Russian Supreme Soviet. The Leningrad referendum is set for 12 June.

Kaliningrad To Hold Referendum on Changing Name

LD0205191391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 2 May 91

[Text] The Kaliningrad Oblast Soviet has adopted a decision to hold an oblast referendum on 12 June, the day of presidential elections in Russia. The issue: Whether or not Mikhail Kalinin should remain in the town's name.

It is not clear whether the issue of returning the historical name will be raised, or whether the results of this referendum will be regarded as final or only as a subject for further discussions. If the latter is true, then the referendum is pointless. All the opinion polls that have been conducted have shown that the majority of residents are for changing the town's name.

Moscow Gorkom Criticizes Anticrisis Program

PM0305124791 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 91 p 1

["Statement by the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum"—MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Today there is no sphere of vital activity in our country which has not been plunged into the most severe crisis. The very existence of our socialist state has been put in jeopardy. The mechanisms of control have been destroyed. The lack of constructive will on the part of the leadership of the country and the party has led to the noble ideas of perestroyka not being implemented in practice.

We are convinced that, for the sake of the country's survival, civic concord is today essential between all peoples and nations, between Union and autonomous republics, and between all right-thinking political forces on the constitutional basis of emergency anticrisis measures.

It is the CPSU that bears the major responsibility in the people's awareness for the reforms carried out in recent years. In reality, however, socioeconomic policy is being managed by the party's top leaders in the name of the party, but without consultation with the party. Communists will no longer accept chronic delay in action by, and the inaccuracy and ambiguity in the stance of, the CPSU Central Committee, the Politburo, and the general secretary.

We demand from the CPSU Central Committee a detailed and considered scrutiny of the government's anticrisis program at the plenum to be held 24 April this year. In our opinion, the document presented to the USSR Supreme Soviet for discussion was made for effect, does not contain a mechanism for implementing anticrisis measures, and is not convincing regarding their necessity and adequacy. Serious doubts arise as to whether this program is in line with the true interests of the greater part of society. We consider the social cost of the measures proposed by the government to be too high.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, must, at the forthcoming Central Committee plenum, openly acknowledge that the situation in the country is catastrophic, and that the tactics employed to implement economic and political reforms are wrong.

M.S Gorbachev's duty as president and as a Communist is, using the powers he has been given, to immediately set about implementing emergency measures to ensure the country's survival. If he does not do this, the leader of the party and the state will lose the support of Communists and deprive them of their moral right to remain in their posts.

The CPSU Gorkom [city committee] is ready to propose a system of measures to block the crisis and ensure the country's subsequent development.

Details of Ingush-Cossack Clash Reported

PM3004224791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 May 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Ali Kazikhanov: "Conflict in Village"]

[Text] Groznyy—Eight dead, 24 wounded—that is the tally of the clashes between Ingush and local inhabitants in the Cossack village of Troitskoye in Sunzhenskiy Rayon.

A day before the events some unidentified inhabitants of Troitskoye stopped a car containing three young Ingush traveling through the village at about 2300 hours and for no reason at all savagely beat them. The next day two of the victims were discharged from the hospital but the third had to undergo major surgery.

At the hospital, someone in the crowd of people from the village and relatives of the injured man called for revenge against the offenders, and around 200 people set out for Troitskoye. The result was a mass brawl with both sides using weapons, including firearms. Five people—two Russians, three Ingush—died. Another three died from their injuries at the rayon hospital. The conflict was quelled with the aid of 400 staffers of the republic militia. During the attempt to stop the brawl a staffer of the Chechen-Ingush Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], a Chechen by the name of Kilometvo, was killed.

As I was told at the MVD, the situation is being monitored, although it is hard to say how events will develop in the future. A headquarters has been set up at the MVD and investigation groups are at work.

Members of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium interrupted their session to travel to Sunzhenskiy Rayon where they met with inhabitants of Russian and Ingush villages.

It has been decided not to impose a state of emergency, but the republic's May Day demonstration has been canceled.

Dzasokhov Visits Ryazan Oblast Over Holiday

PM0705154191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 91 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Meetings on Ryazan Territory"]

[Text] A.S. Dzasokhov, Politburo member, CPSU Central Committee secretary, and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, visited Ryazan Oblast 1-2 May. He had numerous meetings with representatives of trade union, veteran, and youth organizations over the holiday period.

A.S. Dzasokhov met with oblast party workers 1 May and representatives of the oblast, municipal, and other soviets, intelligentsia, and armed forces. During the meeting he talked about the results of the Joint CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission April Plenum and drew attention to the importance of fully implementing the proposals contained in the statement signed by representatives of nine republics, along with the measures adopted by the state leadership to implement the anticrisis program. Answers were given to numerous questions relating to the life of the party and the situation in society.

Spring field work continues in the oblast fields even during the holiday period. A.S. Dzasokhov visited workers at the "Novaya Zhizn" Sovkhoz [state farm] and studied their experience of increasing the fertility and stability of crop farming.

Western Republics

Belorussian Official on Anticrisis Program

LD0405215891 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Obita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 4 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The declaration by the "Ten" has become an important factor in our domestic political life. How has this document been received in Belorussia? Our correspondent, Aleksey Zhuk, met with Sholodonov, deputy chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

[Begin recording] [Zhuk] Vasiliy Ivanovich, the declaration by the "Ten" entitles us to say that a new formula for our union has been created—the union of sovereign states. What do you think? How viable is this formula!

[Sholodonov] I think that today's declaration by the nine republics and the president will give new impetus to our future work on the draft of the new union treaty.

[Zhuk] How realistic can this sovereignty be in our republic? [Sholodonov] I think that if you read this document very attentively—and it is being criticized from both the right and the left—I do not think that the leaders who signed the document are today against the sovereignty of their own republics. I could say more. Kebich, the esteemed chairman of our Council of Ministers, is very jealous about ensuring that our sovereignty is observed. He is for the sovereignty of our Belorussian Republic. Therefore, if he had any suspicion that the signing of this declaration would violate the sovereignty of our republic, he would never have made so bold as to sign the document.

Second, I think that this document is a reflection of the people's wish which was expressed during the referendum.

[Zhuk] Our republic is preparing for the May session of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet. Of course, this session of the Belorussian parliament is expected to be difficult. All the signs point this way. The government of Belorussia and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet have invited all political forces, including official and unofficial organisations, to take part in the drafting of the anticrisis program.

[Sholodonov] The opposition must draw up its own position on the economy, the development of the state, and politics. Naturally we will listen to what they have to say. If their proposals really do help to improve the people's life, we can only support them. [end recording]

Belorussia Signs Economic Agreement With CSFR

LD0705204391 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 1725 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] A bilateral agreement for economic, scientific, and technical cooperation has been signed by Vladimir Zalamay, deputy chairman of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, and Vaclav Vales, deputy prime minister of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. It envisages not only trade and economic relations but also creating joint ventures, international associations and organizations, and developing cooperation and tourism, as well as other progressive forms of cooperation such as barter deals. Goods intended for export from the CSFR into our republic have been indicated. These are consumer goods; road and construction machinery; equipment for textiles; boot, shoe, and leather-dressing industries; and streetcars; as well as other complex technical equipment. Belorussia will supply appliances and equipment, raw materials, components, and consumer goods. The total sum of the trade turnout for 1991 between the two republics will amount to about 140 million U.S. dollars. Calculations will continue to be made in freely convertable currency.

Belorussia's Kebich on Union Treaty

91UN1428A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 May 91 p 2

[Article by Belorussian SSR (Soviet Socialist Republic) Council of Ministers Chairman V.F. Kebich: "The Country Needs Unity"]

[Text] **A representative of the Belorussian SSR was among those who signed the joint statement by the USSR president and the leaders of nine Union republics on urgent measures to stabilize the situation in the country and to overcome the crisis. Our correspondent V. Legankov asked him to comment on this extraordinary and, to a degree, unprecedented document. This is how Chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers V.F. Kebich responded to this request.**

A meeting convened on the initiative of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev indicated yet again that at present the country needs unity more than anything else. The economy, as well as the state as a whole, may only be saved by means of civil peace and national accord, the consolidation of all healthy forces, a profound political reform, and the renewal of the Union treaty. Otherwise they will be simply swept away by a wave of strikes and spontaneous demands of all kinds which are frequently impossible to meet for the simple reason that there are neither funds nor conditions for this. The situation is exceptionally difficult, and the turn of events may be very harsh unless it is counteracted by means of resolute actions and persistent efforts. The country is on the edge of the abyss; any careless step, be it political or economic, may bring about a disaster.

I believe that everybody will be gratified to see a path toward stabilization, accord, and cooperation outlined in the joint statement made at the recent meeting between the leaders of the nine republics that voted in the all-Union referendum to preserve a renewed USSR and the USSR president. As is known, the statement consists of five points. Every points represents a path toward accord.

As far as specific measures are concerned, the joint statement confirms the obligations of the Union organs and republics set forth in the economic agreement for 1991, as well as the need to fulfill them, primarily with regard to the budgets and the accumulation of off-budget funds.

Here is one more important provision. With a view to stabilizing the situation in the national economy of the country, participants in the meeting came out in favor of introducing a special regimen of work in basic industries, at enterprises producing consumer goods, and in railway transportation.

I would like to stress in particular that the task of supporting agricultural enterprises and those of the agro-industrial complex in general with a view to boosting the production of foodstuffs was made a priority. In the process, we proceeded from the fact that as early as this quarter the governments of the Union and the republics should complete the work in progress on developing an arrangement for maintaining parity in trade between the cities and rural areas in the environment of switching to a market economy and introducing new wholesale prices.

We also took into account the everyday, routine needs of the people. Based on an analysis of the situation that has emerged after retail prices for consumer goods were changed, it was deemed necessary to take a number of measures aimed at making certain revisions in our price policy. As far as our republic is concerned, such corrections have already been made.

The issue of introducing a state of emergency in the country was also discussed. As a result of the discussion, we came to the conclusion that it is feasible to act the way it is set forth in the joint statement: in the spirit of reinforcing the constitutional order and carrying out the measures necessary to this end.

In the course of the meeting, a new formula of our Union as a union of sovereign states was born. It is no accident that the document states that all of the measures aimed at stabilizing the situation and overcoming the crisis are inconceivable without enhancing the role of the Union republics radically. This should be interpreted as the recognition of republic sovereignty, and the center undertook to take this into account.

I must say that this formula was born with great difficulty. It was adopted after a protracted and weighty discussion. As a result, the joint statement points out straightforwardly that the conclusion of a new treaty

between the sovereign states, proceeding from the results of the All-Union Referendum held, is a priority task for overcoming the crisis. Work on the draft should be completed in the immediate future, and after the signing of the treaty, a new Union constitution should be prepared and adopted which will be based on the provisions of the treaty on the union of sovereign states.

I believe that participants in the meeting responded appropriately to political strikes which swept the country, including Minsk and other cities of Belorussia, and demands for the resignation of leading state structures. After the adoption of the new constitution, elections of the new organs of power of the Union provided for by the treaty and the constitution will be prepared and held.

At present, we need to go further and bolster the agreements by actual deeds. As far as Belorussia is concerned, we intend to meet all our obligations to other republics and the Union as a whole in an accurate, timely, and complete manner. We count on our partners in mutual treaties and agreements acting in a similar manner.

We would also like the leaders who signed this document to remember to comply with it themselves, and to monitor its execution. I will say in this reference that we are quite satisfied with the punctuality of counterdeliveries, for example, from Kazakhstan and some other republics, but not all. Disruptions in the provision of metal, wool, and other resources which our neighbors deliver to us within the framework of cooperation keep us on edge. I will say more. The Union press reported on strikes and rallies in Minsk in detail, and meticulously calculated the economic losses they entailed. Indeed, the losses are high, they are put at tens of millions of rubles, which is impermissible, especially given the tremendously overstretched republic budget from which we have to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster that happened through no fault of ours. However, nobody, not even the most independent and bold press organ, calculated or paid attention to the fact that our republic suffers losses far exceeding the consequences of the April strikes in Minsk due to failures to receive the planned deliveries of energy resources, raw materials, equipment, and subcontracted assemblies and parts. As a result, the assembly lines of Belorussian plants are slowed down or even stopped altogether. After all, previously the press made so much noise on every such occasion that the situation was promptly rectified.

Taking this opportunity, I would like to cordially congratulate the editorial collective and millions of readers of the SELSKAYA ZHIZN newspaper which I respect on the Day of International Solidarity of the Working People, the May Day holiday.

Roots of Belorussian 'Explosion' Pondered

91UN1417A Moscow TRUD in Russian 1 May 91 pp 1-2

[Article by TRUD staff correspondent S. Vaganov: "Notes of an Essayist: Explosion"]

[Text] Minsk—**The Belorussian April is on everyone's mind. The flow of information is spewing forth scraps, fragments, and echoes of Belorussian events, which cannot be called anything but an explosion.**

What was the "detonator?" Who lit the "fuse" and to what end?

These questions are bothering many people and, thank God, not purely out of curiosity, although one is aware of an after-taste of sensationalism in the perception of what has happened—this explosion was painfully unexpected, even for us living in Belorussia, as if it had occurred deep in the rear, when there was reliable protection... Having withstood the first blow, it did no good for the confused authorities to start talking about a conspiracy right away, as if some malicious and sly individual, "bored by the stable and calm situation in the republic," had broken the locks and placed a mine under the citadel....

But the time has come, now that we have cooled down from the heat of the events, to try to stop the windmill of the rapidly fleeting April days and taste what has been ground.

...The trade union newspaper BELARUSKI CHAS, in its extra edition devoted to the first wave of Minsk strikes, carried a banner headline "April Theses of Working Class Minsk." It was so reminiscent of 1917.

Well, we can start with that year. Or, rather, with the way its events are perceived today, now that we have pushed so far back the boundaries of historical space in which they tried, and not without some success, to close off human awareness with official propaganda and pseudo-Marxist orthodoxy. History has come alive and become a real, almost palpable factor in our dramatic existence. It is no wonder that the very sight of the columns of many thousands of workers walking away from their machine tools across the entire city to the main Square imeni Lenin, in front of the Government House and the monument to the leader, focused and compressed into a barely noticeable dot the events of more than 70 years of history.

"The revolution continues!" Who does not remember this false slogan of the times of stagnation, this injection of poisonous deceit which clouded the awareness of the social organism?

But here it has continued. And for some reason, we do not hear the thunder of orchestras, nobody is beating the drums, they are not shouting "Long live!" and "Hurrah!"... Fear, pain, a sinking feeling, a lump in the throat, and a gaze aimlessly wandering in the dark recesses of the future—what lies ahead?

What awaits us beyond the next turn in our capricious history? What has the future prepared for each and every one of us?

What lies ahead? In search of an answer to this tormenting question, some people rush headlong into the embraces of weird astrology; others, who are a little stronger, embrace the shaky pillar of party-power authority; still others take advantage of the confusion for their own personal gain; while still others warm up their tank engines...and others...and others... The country is in a frenzy of DISBELIEF. And what is disbelief but all-absorbing FEAR?

Fear of the future into which the past inexorably slides, and in its most tragic hypostasis.

Is this not why, having been born in the country of October, we are so terrified of its repetition?

This is exactly the time to think about this historical paradox. Especially today, when banners decorated with the blood of the Chicago workers who were executed and then resurrected over one-sixth of the planet, have drooped and faded, and the winds of change are rippling altogether different panels, standards, and banners of the most diverse national colorings. Alas, it has not turned out as the deluded generation had dreamed, with a flag of one color flying over the entire planet, or even over a large part of it. And we are writing "April Theses" again. Only those said "Hail, the socialist revolution" and these—are hastily fashioned paper placards raised above our heads: "Down with socialism!"

Where else, in what other country in the world, do the workers throw out this malicious gauntlet as if it were a white flag? And if it were raised in the hands of a "saboteur," why was it not torn to shreds, trampled upon, and reduced to ashes? Have the ideals of socialism really been subjected to such corrosion that an appeal for its overthrow was raised above the city which has always been considered to be its embodiment, and not in the worst sense of the word? Or is this perhaps why it was raised?...

I looked for the answers to these questions last April in the streets and squares of Minsk where the bitter historical experience and the depressing daily existence were compressed into a spring which had almost reached the limit of its resistance; in the echoing corridors of power, with fear, indignation, bewilderment, and barely restrained arrogance, gazing at the ignoble people who had suddenly become disobedient; in the confused offices and halls of the multistoried trade union building; in the stuffy, overcrowded little rooms of the city strike committee, which had found shelter in some municipal office where, accustomed to complaints about lights, water, and leaky roofs, the telephone was literally ringing off its hook with calls from all over Belorussia and, believe me, a large part of the world reached by television, radio, and newspapers...

And so, what has happened?

Speaking on television a couple of days ago, the second secretary of the Minsk Gorkom [city committee] of the Communist Party of Belorussia, V. Chikin, said with obvious regret that the workers should have been led out into the square by communists and not some questionable individuals, as he put it, "friends of the people" with deputy cards and BNF written [Belorussian People's Front] on their threadbare jackets and sweaters.

Trade union leaders are speaking in approximately the same tones. They say that they are the ones who should be leading the people. Because they know better than anyone else how to protect their interests...

Yet the people went out to the square themselves, expressing the lack of confidence of both the Communist Party and the "people's" power and (at the same time) the trade unions which are not yet established in the role of reliable protectors.

Why?

Because of the Great Deception.

If I were asked which feature distinguishes the Belorussian character I would say trustfulness. Everything else derives from this: honesty, modesty, hospitality, simplicity, selfless love of labor, and the ability to tolerate long deprivation and hardship... No, I do not wish—as some democrats as well as their antipodes with their slightly shabby apparatus appearance do—to condemn the people for the fact that they were in no hurry to follow anyone in recent years or to explain this sad fact by saying that as a people they are bad, immature, apathetic, and politically blind.

For the people are not on trial. And they are democratic in their very essence. Even in their mistakes and delusions.

This is why they went out into the square themselves.

But those accustomed to "leading" assume as before that "someone led" them, secretly deploring the fact that they had not done it themselves. So who, one asks, is politically blind?

In their powerlessness to see through and shrug off the "blindness" behind which are concealed powerful interests of the authorities, politicians of the most diverse calibers, of course, try to explain such an unexpected self-organization of the workers by the influence of extremists and the intrigues of destructive forces and other enemies of the "socialist option." Repeating like an incantation that "history will judge" and "the people will figure out who is who," it is as if they see that history, which is created by the people, has already judged and they have already figured out who is who in this great deception—from October with its promises of land, factories, free will, and a bright future, through the GULAG and the Kuropaty mass burial sights, to Chernobyl and the economic catastrophe...

It is impossible to understand anything in the Belorussian events if everything is reduced to stress because of the higher prices and the pernicious influence of extremists, who are supposed to have introduced "politics" into the masses who are frightened by the higher costs of everything and increasingly irritated. If it were to pass away, this cost increase, everything would calm down because, just as the people do not need politics, they do need soup at a reasonable price...

Well, they really did strike; at first just in the electrical equipment plant, and that was because of the ruble additional payment for a meal whose cost had at least tripled.... But why did the entire city burst into flame with just one match, and why did the strike encompass plants where the ruble was not even mentioned because the changes did not affect them as much? And why did the random strike rapidly acquire the character and scope of a political strike—organized, strict, and irreconcilably opposed to the authorities? Since they were unable to extinguish the match, did they decide to let the flame get out of control? Then why did the millions which were hastily found by the government and which, by its own irritated and bitter admission, increased the budget deficit to an unthinkable almost 50 percent, not only not extinguish the flame but fanned the fire even more? Was it not because these millions aggravated their fear of the future even more?

Having lived all my life in Belorussia, I know of no other government that would have worked as long and hard as the present one. And I do not know of any trade unions that would have worked so long and hard. Then what is the matter? What have those who, frankly, went through the hard school of restructuring relations from "country cousin apprentices" to partners, not manage to provide for social protection for the workers and thus ward off the explosion?

In the middle of March, right before the Union referendum, the long-awaited discussion between the head of the Belorussian Government, V. Kebich, and the chairman of the council of the federation of trade unions, V. Goncharik, finally took place. This was a discussion between people who are intelligent, knowledgeable, sober, and sincerely concerned about the people. They discussed the fact that it was extremely difficult but still they managed to set up a mechanism of negotiations and that through reasonable compromises they were managing to unravel about 80 percent of the knots of complicated circumstances related to the transition to the market economy....

At that time I asked why no agreement had been signed between the government and the trade unions regarding measures for social protection, the draft of which had already been published. Vyacheslav Frantsevich Kebich answered that he did not have the right to sign an agreement which could not be fully carried out, for if he did—there would be a confrontation, which nobody needs... I thought that was reasonable, since a confrontation would indeed do nobody any good... Then together we came to the conclusion that we had to radically change the system of economic relations and property relations, that is, the base, that without these decisive changes perestroyka would end up at an impasse. We decided that only the market would put everything in its proper place, rid the government of the functions of an employer which were not appropriate for it, and allow freedom of economic maneuvering with the help of one instrument, albeit not the most powerful one—a flexible tax policy. And the trade unions would finally be able to engage in their own work and get rid of distribution functions for good, having shifted their efforts directly to the sphere of market production, protecting from the employers the material, social, and all the rest of the range of vital interests of hired workers...

Now, reading through the record of that conversation, I can see that in terms of all the parameters, as they say, the government and the trade unions should have been with the people on the square, relying on their support and demanding the same thing they were demanding—a deep reform of Union and republic power structures, which had demonstrated their inability to decisively influence the basic changes. The example, say, of how the government, trying to get from the people understanding, justification, and empathy, and refers to the out-and-out deception of the Cabinet of Ministers is a good one. They promised a one and a half to twofold increase and when at midnight they opened the packages containing the price lists, they found they were much higher... The people agreed that nobody needs that kind of government, which can deceive people so easily.

Alas, our present government and, to a significant degree, the trade unions as well, are unable to be directly with the people or even next to them...

This is why in April the "base" exploded of its own accord. Workers of state enterprises rebelled; the first were those under Union jurisdiction, who recognized the intolerability of a procedure whereby, in the ironic expression of Georgiy Mukhin, a machine adjuster at a plant of Elektronmash and the cochairman of the city strike committee, "the government is wise, the trade unions are brave, but the metal worker is a fool..." In the sense that all the metal worker can do is wait until manna falls from the apparatus heaven as a result of the paper battles between the all-understanding government and the "constructively opposing" trade unions.

I recall that the meeting between the Belorussian prime minister and the trade union aktiv in December lasted about four hours and he persistently and energetically overcame a storm of resolute objections and bold questions, when in the end Yefim Posherstnik, the chairman of the trade union of the forging shop of the tractor plant, suddenly got up and quietly half stated and half asked: "I still do not know what to tell the forge operators and hammerers who sent me here: They are very disturbed and want to know why 12-ruble shoes have disappeared and they have nothing to wear to work..."

I do not know what the forge operators and hammerers from the tractor plant wore when they marched across the entire city in April, but thank God they had the shoes for that journey.

So what do they want?

Briefly, they want the immediate convocation of an extraordinary session of parliament and at it the adoption of corrections to existing and new laws, including those whose drafts were prepared by the parliamentary opposition—concerning privatization, withdrawal of the party from production and depoliticization of state structures, a new law on elections on a multiparty basis, and elections conducted early, in the near future...

And now we can see who is behind the strikers and who has saddled the worker movement—anticommunists, separatists, nationalists, and so forth.

This is not true. The truth is that the people have turned away from those who have essentially betrayed the idea of democracy and social justice, establishing a strict regime of total suppression of human rights and freedoms. And also from those who, having condemned this regime in words, are cutting the grass while leaving the roots untouched.

The people have extended a hand to parliament. "You have been given a unique chance to put an end to the diarchy in the republic," the workers said, appealing to members of the Supreme Soviet Presidium at their meeting with the city strike committee.

This was a meeting, this was an event which had no analogs in the past and is not likely to be repeated in the future. The workers gathered face to face, and behind each of them one could hear the breath of industrial giants and the supreme wielders of power. The latter came on the eve of a new strike, one which was already a republic political strike, in an attempt at mutual understanding, to listen...

Alas, they did not understand and they did not listen. The Presidium, having assembled at its table people of various views and political convictions, spoke as a unified organ and flatly refused to meet the workers' demand for an extraordinary session, regarding it as an unacceptable ultimatum, power pressure from the public square on the supreme authority....

But is the square not seething and are the workers not striking because in essence the authorities are "striking" and vacationing on the holidays when, in the words of one of the participants in the meeting, the emissary from the computer equipment plant, "our house is on fire."

And they are told: Although you are the people, you are not all of them. The rest of the people are out in the fields. And we do not know yet whether they are with you or with us...

And they were also told to return to their machine tools so as not to push the economy into an abyss, that it would be the worse for them, that everything was just about to work out, although it is "impossible to accelerate a heavy car quickly..."

But the "car" is standing still, as if it were glued to the rails. On the agenda of the next (21 May) session, with one minor exception, there are no issues whose resolution was demanded by the strikers on the square. There is an electrically charged void between it and the authorities. And nature, especially political, will not tolerate a void.

For in places where there is a void, an explosion is likely...

Crimean Tatars Send Letter to Gorbachev

LD0505204191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Another all-union meeting of representatives of the Crimean Tatars ethnic movement, from six union republics, took place in Novorossiysk. The meeting was triggered by the fact that the movement's representatives had been denied access to the work of the Crimean oblast executive committee's committee on affairs of deported peoples. The participants in the conference sent a telegram to the USSR president, as well as to the leadership of the Ukraine and of the Crimea, demanding that a committee on organizing a state-wide resettlement of the Crimean Tatar people in the Crimea, should be recreated at a union level. It was also suggested that a mechanism for reinforcing the deputy corps of the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic with representatives of the Tatar population should be worked out. This was reported by the NOVOSTI News Agency.

Draft of New Ukraine Constitution Published

LD0605181891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] A draft of the new constitution of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is carried by today's newspapers in the republic. The document emphasizes that the fundamental law must be based on the declaration of state sovereignty of the Ukraine. The constitution must confirm the socialist choice made by the people of the Ukraine in 1917 and their adherence to a voluntary union, based on equality of rights, of the peoples-members of a renewed federation of sovereign Soviet states. It is suggested that the present name of the Ukrainian state, acknowledged by the Declaration of State Sovereignty of the Ukraine—the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic—should be preserved. The draft new constitution names the president as the supreme official.

[Moscow Mayak Russian at 1630 GMT on 6 May adds that the president "heads executive power in the republic, coordinates the activity of state bodies, and represents the republic in relations with other states and international organizations"]

Moldovan Secretaries Welcome Anticrisis Stance

PM0705155391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 91 Second Edition p 3

[TASS correspondent F. Angeli report: "Meeting of Moldovan Communists"]

[Text] Kishinev, 4 May—A republic meeting of secretaries of primary party organizations was held in the Moldovan capital today. The report was delivered by G. Yeremey, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee.

The participants in the meeting supported the Joint Statement of the USSR president and the leaders of nine union republics on urgent measures to stabilize the situation in the country and overcome the crisis. They adopted an address "To the Republic's Communists and Party Organizations" and to the Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldova Supreme Soviet and also a declaration in connection with the reform of retail prices.

Caucasus

Georgian Power Engineering Ministry Created

AU0605183891 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 20 Apr 91 p 4

["Law of the Republic of Georgia on the Creation of the Ministry of Electric Power Engineering of the Republic of Georgia," issued in Tbilisi on 18 April 1991]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia **resolves**:

to create the Ministry of Electric Power Engineering of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] Z. Gamsakhurdia, President of the Republic of Georgia.

18 April 1991, Tbilisi.

Minister Appointed

AU0605130491 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 24 Apr 91 p 1

["Decree of the President of the Republic of Georgia on the Appointment of Z.V. Mindeli as Minister of Electric Power Engineering;" and biography of Z.V. Mindeli]

[Text] To appoint Zurab Vik'tor Dze [son of Viktor] **Mindeli** as Minister of Electric Power Engineering of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] Zviad Gamsakhurdia, president of the Republic of Georgia.

Tbilisi. 23 April 1991.

Zurab Vik'tor Dze Mindeli

He was born in 1937 in the village of Sori in Oni Rayon into a white-collar family. In 1956 he completed secondary school, and in 1962 he graduated from the Georgian (former) Polytechnical Institute with a speciality in thermal power engineering. In 1974, he also completed his postgraduate studies there.

During 1961-63, Zurab Mindeli was assigned to work according to his speciality in Tula Oblast from where, on instructions from the Georgian Council of Ministers, he was transferred to the Tbilisi State Electric Power Station. He held various executive positions there.

During 1981-84, he was abroad, in Iraq, as one of the leading Soviet specialists in the operation and repair of thermal electric power stations and as leader of the group of Soviet specialists.

From 1985, he was again in Georgia. During 1985-86, he was in charge of the construction of the Georgian Atomic Power Station. During this period, on the basis of a principled and correct assessment of questions of investigation and expertise, he established the inexpediency of constructing an atomic power station in Georgia which, as a result, was finally closed. From 1987, he worked as director of the Tbilisi State Regional Electric Power Station and from 1990 as general director of the industrial association "Sakenergo."

He has a wife and three sons.

Georgian Supreme Soviet Renames Ministry

AU0605184091 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 20 Apr 91 p 4

["Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia on Renaming the Ministry of Material and Technical Supply and State Reserves of the Republic of Georgia," issued in Tbilisi on 18 April 1991]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia **resolves**:

to rename the Ministry of Material and Technical Supply and State Reserves of the Republic of Georgia as the Ministry of Material Resources of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] A. Asatiani, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia.

18 April 1991, Tbilisi.

Wording of Statute on Military Service Changed

AU0605131591 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 20 Apr 91 p 4

["Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia on the Introduction of Changes Into the Provisional Statute on the Procedure of Undergoing Military

Service in Internal Troops—the National Guard of the Republic of Georgia," issued 18 April 1991, Tbilisi]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia **resolves**:

to introduce the following changes into the "Provisional Statute on the Procedure of Undergoing Military Service in the Internal Troops—the National Guard of the Republic of Georgia" ratified by the resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia on 29 January 1991:

1. In Article 9, the words "Presidium of the Supreme Soviet" must be replaced by the word "President."

2. In Article 13, the words "Presidium of the Supreme Soviet" must be replaced by the word "President."

3. In Article 14, the words "Presidium of the Supreme Soviet" must be replaced by the word "President."

4. In paragraphs four and six of Article 17, the words "Presidium of the Supreme Soviet" must be replaced by the word "President."

[Signed] A. Asatiani, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia.

18 April 1991, Tbilisi

Ter-Petrosyan Gives News Conference 7 May

LD0705182791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1518 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] The situation on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan remains tense. This was the subject of a news conference given in Yerevan today by Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Armenia, for Soviet and foreign journalists. He said, in part:

[Begin Ter-Petrosyan recording] You are familiar with our conception of what is happening. I had the opportunity to say this in Moscow during my news conference and I repeat the arguments and assertions that I stated then. We regard what happened in Getashen and Martunashen as the forcible deportation of Armenians and as an act of state terrorism carried out by the forces of the Soviet Army, Internal Troops, and the Azerbaijan militia according to a plan prepared in advance. That is our asessment of what happened there. That was about Getashen.

About what is being done on the territory of Armenia, what happened in Voskepar yesterday, in Noyemberyanskiy Rayon of Armenia, in the village of Voskepar, is evidently familiar to you. In the morning, subunits of the Soviet Army and Internal Troops burst into the territory of Armenia and surrounded the village of Voskepar, Noyemberyanskiy Rayon of Armenia. This operation is continuing today. Moreover, it is expanded. In the morning, the same operation, following the same plan, was carried out in Gorisskiy Rayon of Armenia. It is the southeastern rayon of Armenia. Three villages of that rayon—the villages of Tekh, Kornidzor, and Shurnukh—were surrounded in the same way as Voskepar. According to our data, over 20 people were arrested in these villages and taken away. We do not know where. These were mainly Armenian militiamen.

Our assessment of these actions is that, from the legal point of view, the Soviet Army and Internal Troops do not have the right to carry out such operations, because such operations are envisaged only on the condition that a state of emergency is declared on this territory. [end recording]

In replying to a question from journalists about whether Armenia would take part in the conciliation commissions spoken about by Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs, at yesterday's session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Levon Petrosyan stated that in the USSR if there is some question that they do not wish to resolve, they usually set up such commissions. The eight months' experience of our fruitless talks with the leadership of Azerbaijan, he added, once again prove that in the first place it is essential to restore the disbanded structures of Soviet power in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and their acknowledgement as subjects in any talks about a settlement of the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Accuses Army of Interference

LD0705171591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1517 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 7 May (TASS)—"The army stationed on the territory of Armenia is conducting no operations whatsoever," Lieutenant General Nikolay Pishchev, chief of the Yerevan Garrison, has stated—while Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, today accused the Soviet Army of conducting "punitive operations on the territory of Armenia."

In an interview published today in RESPUBLIKA ARMENIA, General Nikolay Pishchev said that "one of the army's tasks today is to in no way interfere in the interethnic conflict." He said that "our task remains unchanged: to defend the country's southern borders."

The head of the Armenian legislature held a news conference today at which he called the actions of subunits of the army and Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs in Armenian rayons bordering on neighboring Azerbaijan "an act of aggression" and "undeclared war against Armenia." Citing the commander of troops of the Transcaucasian Military District, Ter-Petrosyan made clear that "this operation was conducted not by the Soviet Army but by internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs subordinate to the Azerbaijan authorities."

In Ter-Petrosyan's view, juridically speaking the Soviet Army and internal troops of the USSR "have no right to

conduct such operations because they are envisaged only when a state of emergency is declared on a given territory."

USSR Minister of Internal Affairs Boris Pugo yesterday told the country's legislature that villages on the territory of Azerbaijan inhabited by Armenians "have been turned into forward bases for illegal Armenian armed groupings." He stated that the Ministry of Internal Affairs, KGB, and Ministry of Defense of the USSR are carrying out measures to disarm illegal formations, acting on the basis of the relevant decree by the country's president last 25 July.

In a statement by its Ministry of Foreign Affairs published today, Azerbaijan accused Armenia of "escalating the open aggression of Armenian nationalist forces" against the neighboring republic. The statement says that in four months, 304 attacks have been made by Armenian fighters on Azerbaijan populated centers, as a result of which 60 people have died.

ARMENPRESS has circulated a statement by the standing commission of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Armenia which asserts that "the Soviet Union has begun wide-scale combat actions against the Armenian people and the Republic of Armenia."

The USSR Supreme Soviet, having today turned down Armenia's request for an emergency session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies to be convened to discuss the situation on the border between the two Transcaucasian republics, decided to send a special group from the USSR Procuracy and other official bodies to the region to clarify all facts claimed by both the Armenian and Azerbaijani sides.

Kochetov Refutes Allegations

LD0705183391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 7 May (TASS)—Konstantin Kochetov, first deputy USSR minister of defense, in an interview for the newspaper IZVESTIYA, today commented on statements by Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, concerning actions by units of the Soviet Army on Armenian territory.

The head of the Armenian legislature stated on 6 May that "units of the 4th Army of Soviet troops deployed on Azerbaijan territory, using tanks, aviation, and heavy artillery, razed the village of Voskepar in the Noyemberyanskiy Rayon of Armenia."

The statement by the chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet is not true, General Kochetov stressed. Some units of the Transcaucasian Military District are indeed taking part in the fulfillment of the well-known decree of the USSR president "On Prohibuting the Creation of Armed Groupings not Envisaged by USSR Legislation, and the Removal of Weapons in the Event of Their Being Illegally Stored."

Soldiers are "waging a struggle not with the civilian population, but with fighters, removing from them illegally acquired weapons, particularly those seized as a result of a bandit attack on stores of the Transcaucasian Military District," Konstantin Kochetov pointed out. He announced that army helicopters are overflying Noyemberyanskiy Rayon, but "they are not firing on land-based targets." In his words, the helicopters are engaged in reconnaissance, attempting to discover the bases of the extremists, and caches of weapons and military equipment that have indeed been discovered in the vicinity of the village of Voskepar, which include anti-hail guns and armored personnel carriers.

As a result, "an operation was conducted to destroy this equipment. No tanks or heavy artillery took part in it," General Kochetov said.

Shatalin, Kochetov Cited on Transcaucasus

PM0705193191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[S. Mostovshchikov report: "Armenia and Azerbaijan Make Statements. The War, However, Continues"]

[Text] On 6 May, the Armenian and Azerbaijan Republics each issued an official statement in which they blame each other and the center for the border hostilities. While the politicians tackle the question of who to pin the "entire responsibility for what is happening" on, the number of victims from the conflict is growing. According to the editorial office's information, 13 people have been killed in the village of Voskepar (Armenia's Noyemberyanskiy Rayon) alone in the last 24 hours.

On the evening of 6 May, L. Ter-Petrosyan telephoned Feliks Mamikonyan, Armenia's permananent representative at 2 Armyanskiy Pereulok in Moscow and read him the following two paragraphs;

"The Soviet Union has declared de facto war on Armenia. The Soviet Army is continuing punitive operations on Armenian territory. Subunits of the Fourth Army of Soviet troops, stationed on Azerbaijani territory, have used helicopters, tanks, and heavy artillery to raze to the ground the village of Voskepar, in Armenia's Noyemberyanskiy Rayon. All the houses have been destroyed and nearby orchards and woodland burned down. Dozens of people have been killed. Helicopters have started shelling certain villages in Gorisskiy Rayon.

"Colonel General Patrikeyev, commander of the Transcaucasus Military District, reported today to Ashot Manucharyan, Armenia's acting minister of internal affairs, via Lieutenant General Pishchev, that this operation was carried out not by the Soviet Army but by subunits of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] Internal Troops under the command of the Azerbaijani authorities."

At 2200 hours on 6 May INTERFAX reported an Azerbaijan MVD statement which says that Armenia is

conducting combat operations against Azerbaijan and has only itself to blame if catastrophe is in prospect. A statement by Azerbaijan President A. Mutalibov, who recalls that in 1988-1989 Azerbaijanis were deported from Armenian territory while around 200,000 Armenians are now living in Azerbaijan, was also cited. Judging by this statement, the president is implying that his republic does not intend to deport them in revenge but is now simply carrying out measures to check passports.

In a situation where neither the republics nor the center wish to acknowledge blame it is extremely difficult to obtain reliable information on what kind of "measures" are being carried out in the border rayons and who exactly is taking part in them. No doubt the first thing that should be done is to establish what these units of the USSR MVD Internal Troops under the command of the Azerbaijani authorities are.

According to Yuriy Shatalin, commander of the USSR MVD Internal Troops, every republic has such dual-command subunits. They are referred to as motorized militia units, and the personnel wear a militia uniform. Up to 15 percent of the local population may be recruited into such subunits. These units execute the orders of the republic authorities.

In the Armenian village of Getashen (Chaykend), Azerbaijan's Khanlarskiy Rayon, passports are being checked by the Gyandzhinskiy Battalion (around 200 men)—a dual-command subunit. The men under the command of Colonel General Shatalin are merely on the approaches to Getashen and are engaged in preventing attempts by Azerbaijani militants to force their way into the village. As the commander said, if posts and checkpoint had not been set up then convoys of trucks carrying people ready to cut Armenians to pieces would long since have poured into Getashen.

Shatalin's men are also engaged in evacuating the population from Getashen (Chaykend) at the request of the Armenian Government. Around 1,300 women, children, and old people have already been brought out. Presently 500-600 men remain in the village. There has been no firing there for three days now.

The situation in the village of Voskepar, Noyemberyanskiy Rayon, and in the Gorisskiy Rayon of Armenia is less clear. As IZVESTIYA's correspondent Sergey Bablumyan reports from Yerevan, all communications have been severed in the village of Voskepar. The Armenian MVD reports that, according to preliminary figures, 13 local inhabitants died at the scene of the events and 35 personnel of republic internal affairs organs have been taken from Noyemberyanskiy Rayon to an unknown destination.

Hostilities are also continuing on the Gorisskiy section of the Armenian-Azerbaijan border. As Robert Aleksanyan, chairman of the Gorisskiy Rayispolkom [Rayon Soviet Executive Committee], reported by telephone this morning, military subunits have entered six villages in the rayon, people have been wounded, houses and agricultural buildings destroyed, and militiamen seized and carted off.

Levon Ter-Petrosyan has sent a letter to Leonid Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. It requests that a group of deputies be sent to Armenia to learn about the situation on the spot and help stop further bloodshed.

Colonel General Shatalin maintains, however, that not one of his men is in the Voskapar village area.

"I am ready to answer for my words," the commander said.

"Voskepar was indeed under the protection of my company (around 60 men), but on 2 May I received a report that the company was going to be attacked. I ordered my company to pull out, but the miliants nevertheless stopped my men at Dilizhan, disarmed them, and effectively took them hostage. It was precisely after this incident that I had my discussion with Mamikonyan, Armenia's permanent representative in Moscow."

Feliks Mamikonyan commented on the content of this sensational conversation for IZVESTIYA as follows:

"I appreciate that the general has suffered a setback and do not hold this against him. But the discussion does show the excited state in which the army finds itself. Mr. Shatalin told me that he would take Armenians in Moscow, Leningrad, and Rostov-na-Donu as hostages in the ratio of one to ten if his men were not released.

Colonel General Shatalin does not deny that he may have been unduly harsh. But he remains convinced that he has found himself in a situation where he and his men became scapegoats, in a situation where no one wants to tackle the problem by peaceful, civilized means. Yuriy Shatalin is not certain what accusations will be brought against him tomorrow, but he is certain of one thing, namely that his men have nothing to do with the events in Voskepar.

We then turned to the Defense Ministry for comment. Army General K. Kochetov, USSR first deputy defense minister, told our correspondent, Viktor Litovkin, the following:

"The statement by the chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet is not true. Several subunits of the Transcaucasus Military District are indeed taking part in the execution of the USSR Presidential Decree of 25 July 1990 "On Banning the Creation of Armed Formations Not Provided for by USSR Legislation and on the Seizure of Illegally Held Weapons."

"But our servicemen are not fighting against the civilian population, but against militants, seizing illegally acquired weapons from them, particularly those seized as a result of bandit attacks on Transcaucasus Military District depots. Yes, our helicopters are carrying out flights over Noyemberyanskiy Rayon, but they are not

firing at targets on the ground. They are, however, carrying out reconnaissance, trying to discover the extremists' bases and dumps of arms and combat equipment; and such equipment was indeed discovered in the Voskepar village area. This included hail guns, which are used to shell our soldiers on the border between the two republics, and armored personnel carriers...seized from the DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy].

"An operation to destroy this equipment was then mounted. No tanks or heavy artillery took part in it."

Shatalin Denies Claimed Transcaucasus Visit

PM0705094591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 May 91 First Edition p 3

["Rejoinder" by Colonel General Yu. Shatalin, commander of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops: "Independent Lie"]

[Text] The NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA ["Independent Newspaper"] of 5 May this year, in its characteristic manner of publishing under the guise of "impartiality" what is, to put it mildly, unverified information, has published a collection of materials under the heading "Armenia and Azerbaijan: Is War Beginning?" Never mind the fact that the majority of facts contained in it regarding the activity of the Internal Troops in Nagorno-Karabakh and adjacent rayons of Azerbiajan have been selected in a crudely tendentious way; some are simply made up.

Thus, the item mentions that on 22 April Shatalin visited a disposition of forces (they mean the Transcaucasus—Yu.Sh.). Gunfire lasted all night....

The entire absurdity of this assertion consists, however, in the fact that I spent that day in Moscow and despite the claims of the author—Gagik Karapetyan—I was not with the troops but at my work place on Krasnokazarmennaya Street. What can you say here, there should probably be moderation in all things, including lying.

The author's intentions, incidentally, are visible to the naked eye—making yet another attempt to blacken the Internal Troops in the eyes of the people, if only by discrediting their commander. I think these attempts are vain—people will find out where the truth is and where there are lies. Even independent lies.

Attacks on Armenian Villages Described

Atrocities Reported

NC0705120191 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1000 GMT 7 May 91

[Report by correspondent Manuk Ter-Stepanyan]

[Text] You already know from our reports about the situation in our republic's border regions—Nagorno-Karabakh—and Getashen as of 1500 yesterday. We now bring you information we received from the Internal Affairs Ministry last night:

At 1705 a cable arrived from Stepanakert advising that new (?atrocities) were being committed against the men who remained behind in Getashen and Martunashen. A report from Stepanakert at 2050 stated that 1,100 people had arrived there, mostly women and children. The men were kept back in Getashen.

Noyemberyanskiy Rayon: The Russian Supreme Soviet people's deputies arrived in the rayon at (?1900) and left for Voskepar an hour later.

Gorisskiy Rayon: At 1900 two helicopters fired on the road near the village of [name indistinct] and then flew off. Half an hour later, two (?helicopters) and a tank attacked the militia post near the village of Teg and bombed the guard post.

This morning I interviewed Suren Saakyan, deputy interior minister of the Armenian Republic:

[Begin recording] [Ter-Stepanyan] Please tell our listeners in detail, if possible, about the general situation prevailing in the border region.

[Saakyan] The village of Voskepar was surrounded yesterday. This was already reported [words indistinct]. Militia workers wearing militia uniforms were there to defend the borders. [Words indistinct] they were fired upon. A number of people were captured and taken to [words indistinct].

Furthermore, (?troops) coming from the direction of Lachin have surrounded the village of Kornidzor and taken prisoners to Kubatlu. (?What was done) in Voskepar yesterday is now being repeated in Gorisskiy. These are the kinds of military actions that are being taken against the staff of the Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry [words indistinct].

[Ter-Stepanyan] Mr. Saakyan, you are usually in close contact with the military. What do they say?

[Saakyan] We are in contact with the leaders of the Caucasian and Transcaucasian internal troop units [words indistinct]. The first deputy commander of the Transcaucasian Military Okrug is in Yerevan at the moment, and when we asked what sort of military operations were being conducted in Armenia, he said he had no information about any operations. It is very strange that military operations are being conducted in his okrug and the army is unaware of them. [Words indistinct] the army is telling us: They are Azerbaijan's Internal Troops and if you want, you can contact Azerbaijan President Mutalibov and (?talk to him). In effect, they are (?pushing) us to contact Mutalibov and accept all his demands on Nagorno-Karabakh. [end recording]

11 Armenian Troops Killed

LD0705130891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] The conflict on the Armenian-Azerbaijan border is not abating. As Audrey Veduta, our correspondent, has reported from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], on Monday evening [6 May] 1,090 people, primarily women and children, were brought into Stepanakert from the villages of Chaykend, Getashen, and Martunashen in Khanlarskiy Rayon of Azerbaijan. Since 4 May a total of 1,417 residents have been brought to NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] from these Armenian villages.

According to latest information, 11 officers of the Armenian MVD and one driver were killed in the armed clash which took place in the village of Voskepar in Noyemberyanskiy Rayon. Moreover, the corpses of the dead were only returned to the Armenian side following intervention by deputies of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet who were in the area. Forty officers of the Armenian MVD were taken hostage. The firing upon (?Gorisskiy) Rayon continues. The number of victims is being ascertained.

The Azerbaijan Ministry of Foreign Affairs has expressed readiness to receive all who want to see the true state of affairs for themselves in order to provide the public with truthful information about the events in the Transcaucasus region. This is mentioned in a statement from the ministry published in the Baku newspapers today.

Death Toll of 23 Claimed

AU0705124891 Paris AFP in English 1159 GMT 7 May 91

[By Sylvie Lanteaume]

[Text] Yerevan, Armenia, May 7 (AFP)—Soviet soldiers trying to disarm Armenian militiamen staged new attacks on Armenian villages Tuesday, firing from helicopters on at least two locations in the southeast near Goris, Armenian leaders said.

Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan, meanwhile, told reporters that the death toll from the assault late Sunday and Monday that destroyed the northern village of Voskepar was 23 so far, and that operations there were still underway. His figure upgraded an official toll of 13 announced in parliament earlier Tuesday, of which 10 were Armenian Interior Ministry militiamen and three armed militia volunteers.

Mr. Ter-Petrosyan again denounced what he called Moscow's "undeclared war" against Armenia, and said such operations could only be sanctioned "if a state of emergency had been decreed, which is not the case here".

He said he had just received word that four Soviet Army helicopters were firing on the village of Kirants [as received], near Goris.

Earlier, Khachik Stambultian [name as received], a member of the parliament's presidium, said a helicopter assault was launched on the village of Khanzuresk [as received], also near Goris, at 6 a.m. (0200 GMT) and that the village was surrounded by army tanks and armored vehicles. Soldiers were making identity checks and disarming Armenian militia, he said.

Mr. Ter-Petrosyan said the attacks were "an act of aggression, of undeclared war against Armenia."

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Interior Minister Boris Pugo on Monday defended the action in Armenia, stating it was in accordance with a July, 1990 presidential decree ordering the breakup of illegal armed groups.

"You do not disarm people with such methods," Mr. Ter-Petrosyan said Tuesday. "There exist more legal ways to do so. What they want is to terrorize the Armenian people and to obtain by any means the resignation of the legal power" in Armenia.

Mr. Ter-Petrosyan said Soviet troops were also making identity checks and disarming residents in the villages of Tekh, Kornidzor and Churnukh [as received], all in the Goris region.

Mr. Ter-Petrosyan said 20 people had been arrested Tuesday and taken towards Azerbaijan, the neighboring republic with which Armenia has long fought bloody ethnic and territorial disputes.

The Armenian president said he thought a solution could be reached, but warned that "no dialogue with Azerbaijan is possible" unless Nagorno Karabakh could take part. Nagorno-Karabakh, an Armenian majority enclave within Azerbaijan, is one of the most hotly disputed regions.

"We are strong enough to maintain order in Armenia and to defend our borders against bandits, but we cannot fight against the Soviet Army," he said.

Mr. Stambultian, meanwhile, ruled out any surrender by Armenian militia volunteers. "These armed groups are legal, they are under the control of the Armenian Interior Ministry. They are here at the call of the Armenian parliament, and will not surrender their arms," he told parliament.

Mr. Stambultian told parliament that Voskepar had been guarded mainly by militiamen from the Armenian Interior Ministry when the Soviet attacked late Sunday and early Monday, firing from helicopters. He said the army had also taken 40 hostages, mostly Interior Ministry militiamen.

Mr. Stambultian charged that Moscow "wanted to break the process of self-determination that Armenia had undertaken legally, respecting timetables set down by the Soviet Constitution".

He recalled that Armenia voted last March to organize a referendum on whether to remain part of the union six months later—on September 21—the delay "stipulated by Soviet legislation".

Mr. Stambultian said military operations last week against two Armenian villages within Azerbaijan, Getashen and Martunashen, had left 18 people dead and 19 others missing. Earlier tolls had said 36 died in the clashes. He said 43 people from these two villages had been taken away by the attackers, whom he said were special Azerbaijan Interior Ministry troops backed up by Soviet Army units. Half have been returned in a prisoner exchange for Armenian Interior Ministry militiamen.

Some of the freed Armenian hostages said four of those captured were shot dead, according to Mr. Stambultian.

'Demolished Houses' Reported

AU0805071991 Paris AFP in English 0232 GMT 8 May 91

[Report by Sylvie Lanteaume]

[Text] Noyemberyan, Soviet Union, May 8 (AFP)—Soviet troops used nine tanks, 24 armored vehicles and six helicopters to take a tiny Armenian village, the local militia leader said Tuesday.

According to local leaders, the operation, which they said left 11 militiamen and two civilians dead, was designed to disarm Armenian militias along this area near Armenia's strife-torn border with Azerbaijan.

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, warning that civil war was at hand, has vowed to disarm all militias to prevent further bloodshed. Armenian leaders insist that the militias are controlled by Armenia's Interior Ministry, backed by its freely elected parliament, and will not surrender.

The attack occurred Monday in Voskepar, a village five kilometers (three miles) from here, from which journalists have been barred. Between Voskepar and the border lies an Azerbaijani enclave that has become the focus of growing ethnic tensions.

Major Trigran Sarkissyan, the militia leader here, said the Soviet troops that swept through the area had also disarmed his militia. Demolished houses in the area testified to the violence of the attack. Shaking with anger, Major Sarkissyan told a visitor, "I was completely disarmed, me, on my land. From now on," he continued, "I believe every Armenian has the right to bear arms."

Quoting Soviet officers, he said the deaths at Voskepar occurred after nine T-72 tanks and 24 armored vehicles had surrounded the village and six helicopters had brought in troops.

Shortly afterwards, according to Major Sarkissyan and the president of the Noyemberyan local council, Vartan Pachikyan, a bus full of Armenian militiamen arrived on the scene. The bus had come from Noyemberyan, carrying a fresh team that was to relieve another team sent to protect Voskepar from Azeri attacks. When the bus arrived at Voskepar, Soviet officers ordered it to stop. When the bus didn't stop, they opened fire, killed 11 militiamen, then moved into the village, killing two civilians and injuring two. The surviving Armenian militiamen were arrested by the Soviet troops and taken to Azerbaijan, the Armenians said.

Major Sarkissyan said he only recovered the bodies of his men after the intervention of a Russian legislative commission investigating the troubles on the spot.

The figure of 13 was nearly half the toll of 23 announced earlier Tuesday in Yerevan by the president of Armenia, Levon Ter-Petrosyan, who has accused Moscow of siding with Azerbaijan in the three-year-old conflict between the two republics.

Earlier in Yerevan, Armenian officials charged that fresh Soviet attacks were carried out Tuesday against two Armenian villages, Kirants and Khanzuresk. The claim could not be independently verified.

In Moscow, the Soviet legislature overwhelmingly rejected an Armenian request for a special session on Armenia, noting that previous sessions had failed to turn up a solution, but it decided to send a panel to confer with both sides.

Armenia Says Incidents 'Warning to All'

NC0805093991 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 7 May 91

[Joint statement issued by the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet's Standing Commission on Human Rights and Nationalities Affairs and Commission for the Establishment of Independent Statehood and National Policy Affairs in Yerevan; date not given]

[Text] The Soviet Union launched large-scale military operations against the Armenian people and the Armenian Republic on 6 May. The incidents preceding it, including the barbarities committed in the Armenian villages of Getashen and Martunashen by the Soviet Armed Forces, the forced deportation of residents, the shelling of Armenian territory along the entire Armenian-Azerbaijani border, and the withdrawal of the USSR Internal Troops from Armenia, constituted the preparatory stage for the large-scale aggression of 6 May. On that day the Soviet Army's tanks, heavy artillery, and Air Force launched an air and land strike against the territory of the Armenian Republic, razed Voskepar

village in Noyemberyanskiy Rayon, and then went on to act in a similarly barbarous fashion against a number of villages in Gorisskiy Rayon.

The aggression launched against Armenia must be a warning to all peoples and republics of the Soviet Union which have chosen the path of freedom and democracy. Armenia has frequently raised the alarm that new methods to fight people were being tried out here. Sumgait was followed by Fergana and Osh; the military terrorism in Stepanakert and at Zvartnots airport was followed by the incidents in Tbilisi, Moldova, and the Baltic republics; the blockade of Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia was followed by the blockade of Lithuania and Latvia. Now the Soviet Union is using the full might of its Armed Forces to wage war against Armenia. Who will be next?

For all these crimes, including the massacres organized against the Armenian people and the present military aggression, the highest leadership of the Soviet Union must be brought before the court of humanity.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Appeals for Unity

NC0705101691 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1950 GMT 6 May 91

["Appeal to the Armenian people" issued in Yerevan on 6 May by the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Republic]

[Text] The Armenian people, who for the last three years have experienced the ups and downs, (?losses), emotions, and disillusionment of the national liberation struggle, have made their choice in favor of freedom. Time will prove the [word indistinct] of that choice. Soviet imperialism first tried to forcibly block our path to freedom in Sumgait and then in Baku. It is now trying to do the same in Getashen.

Attempts to forcibly check the natural process of the collapse of the Soviet Union are continuing. The course of history and the unfolding developments confirm that the only way to avert further tragedy is to attain the independence toward which our national state, established through the victory of the democratic forces, is proceeding with [word indistinct] firm steps. Radical steps have been taken to introduce a multi-party system and various forms of ownership and to consolidate democracy [words indistinct]. It was only natural that the central authorities in Moscow should resort to intrigues (?to strangle) the will of the Armenian people who are proceeding toward independence through legal procedures. With this aim in mind, they are committing atrocities in Nagorno-Karabakh, Getashen, and Shaumyanovskiy and instigating interethnic clashes in regions bordering Azerbaijan. The Soviet Union uses not only the Azerbaijani communist administration but also the army to further this goal.

(?Events) have shown that our people become even more united and resolute at critical times. They are aware that they will suffer many trials along this path, but they also know that a retreat would not only multiply the (?danger) but also inflict irreparable losses. The most important condition for attaining our national aspiration rests in the unity of all political forces and social groups around the Armenian state. [Words indistinct] self-centered group and party policies may destabilize the situation and deal a blow to Armenian statehood.

The Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet and Government are resolved to continue the course they have chosen and will resolutely confront any (?force and intrigue) directed against the national interests and (?statehood). [passage indistinct]

Armenia Investigating Soviet Troop 'Inactivity'

NC0705130291 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 2100 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] As we reported, a criminal investigation has been launched in connection with the inactivity of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry's internal troop subunits stationed in Armenia, the misleading reports filed by them, and their dereliction of duty.

A preliminary investigation has revealed that the reports to the center filed daily by the commandant's office of the operative military unit stationed in Armenia were misleading in nature and based not on fact but on personal views and the lies concocted in and received from Azerbaijan. Some of the reports on the prevailing political situation in Armenia were nothing more than slander and seemed intended to sow enmity between the peoples.

It has emerged that the operative unit of the Internal Troops had no instructions to defend the Armenian population in the regions bordering Azerbaijan. Instead, it was instructed not to open fire. When the Azerbaijanis fired on settlements in Noyemberyanskiy Rayon on 2 May, the Internal Troops battalion stationed there was instructed to leave the area. According to a statement by the battalion commandant, tanks and artillery of the Soviet Army unit stationed in Azerbaijan fired into Armenia.

The investigation continues.

Border Situation, Arrival of Refugees Reviewed

NC0805092891 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] The situation in the border zone as of the afternoon of 7 May was as follows:

Noyemberyanskiy Rayon: A group of people's deputies from the Russian Supreme Soviet was unable to travel from Noyemberyan to Voskepar village by helicopter after soldiers warned the group by radio that the helicopter would be hit if it took off. The group traveled to Voskepar by ambulance instead. Once in the village, the deputies were shown a number of artillery pieces whose guns were trained on Kazakhskiy Rayon by a military

official there. No such equipment had been in Voskepar before yesterday afternoon. The soldiers have said that they only entered Voskepar to silence the fire coming from the Armenian guerrillas.

At the appeal of the Russian people's deputies, the commandant's office of the USSR Armed Forces allowed 13 bodies to be removed from Voskepar, which remains surrounded and is coming under constant fire. Ten [as heard] of the dead are militiamen.

The paratroopers who landed in Voskepar presented an ultimatum to the defenders of the village, ordering them to leave the settlement by 1400. The ultimatum was rejected. Russian People's Deputy (Anatoliy Shabak) chose to remain behind with the besieged in the surrounded village, declaring that he will not leave Voskepar until a just solution to the problem is found. It would seem that the presence of the people's deputy in Voskepar is preventing the soldiers of the Soviet Army from carrying out their threat and Voskepar is not coming under fire at the moment. How long will this last? This report was filed at 1600 by the ARMENPRES correspondent in Noyemberyan.

Idzhevanskiy Rayon: Diran village has become a target for the troops and Azerbaijani special purpose militia detachment. The guns are never silent there. (Vladimir Krumyan), secretary of the rayon soviet executive committee, reported at noon that the paratroopers who landed there completely surrounded the village with the help of three helicopters and four tanks. They then delivered an ultimatum demanding the surrender of all weapons. The young director of the Diran cooperative, Karen Khartavanyan, and two other villagers were taken hostage.

Correspondents from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and NBC were en route to Diran when their helicopter was fired on by three Army helicopters. An attempt was made to force the helicopter down in (?Akhtsakha) in the Azerbaijani Republic, but the pilot managed to land on Armenian territory [words indistinct].

Gorisskiy Rayon: The attacks by Soviet troops on Armenian villages are continuing. Tekh, (?Aravurts), Shurnukh, and Kornidzor villages have all come under fire, and 17 members of the special operative detachment of the Armenian militia have been taken hostage. Soldiers attacked Shurnukh village with six tanks and fighting is still continuing there. Eleven villagers were taken hostage and one militiamen was killed.

According to reports received by ARMENPRES as of 1700, evacuees from Martunashen and Getashen have been transported to Idzhevan in a convoy of 24 buses. Another two buses took some 200 refugees to Tavushskiy Rayon. Fourteen more buses are still on the way. The bus drivers simply dump these people, who have been uprooted from their native land, at the border and return.

Although the center insists that there is no intention to forcibly deport Armenians from Getashen and Martunashen, the deportation is in fact taking place. Hundreds of Armenians forced to abandon their native lands have taken refuge in Stepanakert. A total of 44 children, women, and old people from Getashen and Martunashen were flown by helicopter from Stepanakert to Yerevan today. The frightened eyes and [word indistinct] of the children, the tired faces of the women and old people, and their tales of suffering provide irrefutable evidence of the barbarities committed by the Soviet Internal Troops and Azerbaijani special purpose militia.

The first group of refugees will be settled in the Narek resthouse in Tsakhkadzor.

Occupation of Power Plant, Party Premises Denied

LD0705105891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] According to clarified information broadcast by our correspondent Karen Khumaryan from Yerevan, citing the Armenian Ministry of Internal Affairs, the information regarding the occupation of the Yerevan nuclear electric power station building by Ministry of Internal Affairs troops is not true. Rumors about the occupation of the Armenian party Central Committee premises by troops is likewise not true.

Kafarova Criticizes Call for Special Congress

LD0705180291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1630 GMT 7 May 91

[Text] Elmira Kafarova, head of the Azerbaijan legislature, branded the call of the Armenian legislature for the convocation of an extraordinary USSR Congress of People's Deputies as crude interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Azerbaijan. Her news conference took place in the permanent mission of the Azerbaijan Republic in Moscow.

As has already been reported, the Armenian Supreme Soviet proposed to discuss at an extraordinary congress the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh, a territory belonging, according to the USSR Constitution, to Azerbaijan. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet declared that call to be unjustified.

Kafarova voiced indignation over the position of the Armenian leadership. On the one hand, its actions are directed toward the republic's secession from the USSR, and, on the other hand, the leadership asks for the convocation of an extraordinary congress.

Sees 'Good Sign'

LD0705233191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1704 GMT 7 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov]

[Text] Moscow, 7 May (TASS)—Elmira Kafarova, chairman of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet, describes the work undertaken by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] troops to clear the fighters [boyeviki] out of the inhabited localities near the Azerbaijan-Armenian border as "a good sign that may lead to the start of a cease-fire."

Elmira Kafarova arranged a news conference in Moscow today after the USSR legislature turned down a request from Armenia for the convening of an extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the Union in order to discuss the situation in the region.

As was announced yesterday in the USSR Supreme Soviet by Boris Pugo, the country's minister of internal affairs, the MVD, the KGB, and the USSR Ministry of Defense are carrying out measures to disarm the illegal formations operating on the basis of the relevant decree of the USSR president dated 25 July last year, since the Armenian villages on the territory of Azerbaijan "have been turned into support bases" for the Armenian fighters. In Yerevan, Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian legislature, today accused the central authorities of the USSR of unleashing "an undeclared war" against that republic.

Elmira Kafarova described as "a crude interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Azerbaijan" the call of the Armenian legislature for the convocation of an extraordinary USSR Congress of People's Deputies to discuss the question of Nagorno-Karabakh, a territory belonging to Azerbaijan according to the USSR Constitution.

"Peace may come about in Nagorno-Karabakh, and there is a basis for it," Elmira Kafarova thinks. Azeris and Armenians, she said, have, from time immemorial, lived in the area together, as neighbors, and have shared both bread and grief. No one will ever forget that.

Peace in the region, she continued, will start not today and not tomorrow. For that to happen, it will be necessary for both Azerbaijan and Armenia to travel a certain path.

Azerbaijan Foreign Ministry Issues Statement

LD0705120391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 7 May 91

[By AZERINFORM-TASS correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Excerpt] Baku, 7 May (TASS)—With a view to providing accurate information to the Soviet and world public on events in the region, the Azerbaijan Foreign Ministry has expressed readiness to accept in this Transcaucasian republic anyone who wants to see the real state of affairs for themselves.

The Azerbaijan Foreign Ministry statement notes that what is under way is "an escalation of open aggression by Armenian nationalist forces which are in effect conducting an undeclared war by one state against another, and that combat operations are being conducted against the civilian population not only of the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] but also the inhabitants of 11 rayons of Azerbaijan and the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic."

Over the first four months of this year, the statement says, 304 armed attacks have been carried out against Azerbaijani centers of population, as a result of which 61 people have died. From 28 April to 3 May, paramilitaries from Armenia subjected over 30 Azerbaijani villages and two rayon centers—the towns Shusha and Kazakh—to intense fire using artillery, armored equipment, and automatic weapons. Four people were killed and 20 wounded, two of them children.

The republican Foreign Ministry states that "continued combat operations by Armenia against Azerbaijan are leading to catastrophe, the blame for which will lie entirely and wholly on the leadership of Armenia, which is grossly violating all the norms of international law." [passage omitted]